



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE SONG OF SONGS, edited as a dramatic poem, with introduction, revised translation and excursuses. Cambridge University Press, 1913. pp. vii + 156. Price 12s. net.

Extracts from Reviews

"Abounds in marks of true scholarship and genuine critical research...and the four excursuses at the end reveal his capacity as a careful scholar and independent investigator." *Athenæum*.

"It is written with taste and enthusiasm....To the reviewer it has afforded much enjoyment which he hopes many other people will share." *Guardian*.

"It is not often that one meets with so completely delightful and satisfactory a work....Mr Cannon's book is a most beautiful study of a poem of consummate charm." *Westminster Gazette*.

"The most scholarly and for the student of the Song the most useful commentary in English." *Expository Times*.

"A very weighty and valuable work indeed.... No student of Canticles can afford to neglect this learned and thoughtful volume." W. St Clare Tisdall in *The Record*.

"It is clearly the work of a careful scholar and a man of keen and appreciative literary instinct." *Church Times*.

THE 68TH PSALM

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

LONDON : FETTER LANE, E.C. 4



NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN CO.

BOMBAY

CALCUTTA

MADRAS

} MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO. OF
CANADA, LTD.

TOKYO : MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE 68TH PSALM

COMPRISING INTRODUCTION, REVISED
TRANSLATION, AND CRITICAL NOTES

BY

WILLIAM WALTER CANNON

202993
17. 5. 26

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1922

1874-1875



PREFACE

MY object in issuing this little book may be expressed in a very few lines. I believe that owing to the difficulties of this Psalm a great many people fail to understand it or fully to enjoy it, and my purpose is to make it intelligible and interesting.

My plan, as in a former publication, is to give a general introduction and a revised translation, relegating all textual and critical discussions to a separate place at the end of the book. If my readers lay down the book with the feeling that they have gained a better comprehension of the meaning of the Psalm, and a higher enjoyment of its poetic beauty, I shall be well content.

I wish to thank the Cambridge Press very heartily for the care and pains they have expended on the production of this work.

W. W. CANNON

July 1922

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
TRANSLATION.	42
CRITICAL NOTES	44
APPENDIX I. ON SUPPOSED INTERPOLATIONS AND GLOSSES	54
APPENDIX II. THE LATIN TEXTS OF THE PSALM	58

INTRODUCTION

THIS vigorous poem—sung by the Jewish Church on the second day of *Shabuoth* (the feast of Weeks, the Harvest feast) and by the Christian Church on Whitsunday—is universally admired, but it is certainly not generally understood. Attempts to fit it into its proper period and to assign to it its proper historical setting have been very numerous and astonishingly various in the conclusions arrived at. Every expositor has based his conclusions upon some statement or some phenomenon in the poem itself and this method is obviously the correct one. But the results of these efforts are sufficiently startling. The Psalm has been dated in almost every period from David to Alexander Jannæus (died B.C. 81), that is, at various dates over a total extent of 1000 years. It will be convenient at the beginning of our work to set out in order some of these schemes of interpretation and to touch briefly on some of the reasons which have led to their adoption. Such an examination will at least have this value—it will bring out in clear relief the extraordinary difficulty of the task to which the present writer has, perhaps with too much rashness, committed himself. If there has been so much difference of opinion in the past, and if no scheme already set forth has entirely satisfied the writer, it must be because the Psalm itself is extraordinarily obscure and difficult to explain.

Dean Johnson¹ assigns the Psalm to David, mainly on the ground of the title, and of the appearance of Zebulun and Naphtali in the procession described in the Psalm which (he thinks) indicates the period of the undivided monarchy.

Bishop Perowne² is of the same opinion for similar reasons. He thinks the allusion to “little Benjamin their ruler” could only have been made very shortly after the death of Saul.

Jennings and Lowe³, not without considerable hesitation, also assign the Psalm to David.

Delitzsch⁴ thinks the Psalm more in the manner of Asaph than of David. From the allusion to “the beast of the reed” he draws the conclusion that the Psalm was written towards

¹ *Speaker's Com.* 1873, iv. 318.

² *Psalms*, 3rd ed. 1873.

³ *Psalms*, 1877.

⁴ *Psalmen*, 5th ed. 1894.

the end of the reign of Solomon. He thinks that the occasion celebrated in the Psalm is the return of the Ark from the campaign recounted in 2 Sam. xi.

Hitzig¹ ascribes the Psalm to the return from the (not very triumphant) campaign of Jehoram and Jehoshaphat against Moab described in 2 Kings iii.

Ewald² assigns the Psalm to the period of the building and inauguration of the second temple (B.C. 516), being largely influenced by the undoubted similarity of its prevailing thoughts with those of Is. xl-lxvi.

Briggs³ decides for the late Persian period when Persia and Egypt were at war, *cir.* B.C. 360-350.

Hupfeld-Nowack⁴ think the Psalm had relation to some event in the battles in Palestine between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. The wars between Ptolemy and Seleucus and their descendants lasted more than 100 years (B.C. 320-198). The particular event which was calculated to call forth such an outburst of religious joy is not identified by them.

Reuss⁵ chooses the same period, finding the Psalm pervaded by a deep feeling of sorrow and depression caused by the plunder and ill-treatment of the people of Palestine by the contending kings and their mercenary auxiliaries.

Wellhausen⁶ fixes the date at B.C. 167, connecting it with the great campaign of Judas Maccabeus across the Jordan described in 1 Macc. v. He thinks the orphans and widows and the forsaken are Jews dwelling in Bashan (v. 22, 1 Macc. v. 26). They are rescued by a Jewish army and, with the exception of some perverse ones who prefer to dwell among the heathen, are brought back to Jerusalem. This very ingenious theory rests entirely on the mention of Bashan twice in the Psalm.

Olshausen⁷ thinks that the Psalm relates to some episode in the wars between Ptolemy Philomētor and Alexander Balas (the supposed son of Antiochus Epiphanes) recounted in 1 Macc. xi. (*cir.* B.C. 150) in the time of Jonathan the Maccabee.

¹ *Psalmen*, 1865, vol. II.

² *Dichter des A. B.* Part I. 2, 3rd ed. 1866.

³ *Int. Crit. Com. Psalms*, 1907.

⁴ *Die Psalmen*, Hupfeld, 3rd ed. by Nowack, 1888, vol. II.

⁵ *La Bible*, v. p. 233.

⁶ *The S. B. O. T., Psalms*, trans. by Prince. *The Book of Psalms*, trans. by Furness, 1898.

⁷ *Psalmen*, 1853.

Duhm¹, who according to his usual method manipulates the text very freely, considers that this is one of the latest of the Psalms and that it celebrates and supports the undertakings of the bloodthirsty ruffian Alexander Jannæus (B.C. 104-78). He gathers from the Psalm that it was written in a time when the Jews made war in Bashan, when they had "rebels" among them, when Sichem was subjugated, and when Galilee was politically united to Judea.

In view of this great variety of opinions, ranging over so long a period, so different and so destructive of each other, it might at first sight seem a hopeless undertaking to attempt to fix with any certainty the period and the occasion which called forth this Psalm. Yet perhaps the very difficulty of the enterprise is an incentive to further effort. The Psalm is so striking, so peculiar, so different from other Psalms that it offers a perpetual challenge. If it can be made to give up its secret, it would repay almost any amount of effort. And it may be that, by examining the explanations which have already been proposed, we may obtain some lights which may guide our steps when we, at the last, turn from the schemes of the commentators and interrogate the Psalm itself.

We begin with some considerations which may tend to limit the area of possible attributions and so to confine the period within which the true date is to be sought for. So in the first place let it be considered whether the period of David and Solomon is compatible with the evidence or indicated by any phenomenon of the Psalm.

(a) This Psalm regards the temple on Mount Sion not only as existing but as an object of veneration and a reason for tributary offerings from foreign kings. This thought excludes not only David as a possible author but also the Davidic period as a possible date for the Psalm to be written. At this period there was no temple, the Ark was kept in a tent (2 Sam. vi. 17, vii. 2)² and it is not conceivable that any kings of foreign countries would bring gifts there. Other but similar considerations make the period proposed by Delitzsch equally inappro-

¹ *Psalmen*, 1899.

² The word *הֵיכָל*, "temple" or "palace," Is. xxxix. 7, Ps. cxliv. 12, could not refer to such a tent. "There is no proof that the word was ever used of this temporary structure." Perowne on Ps. v. 7.

priate. Although there was at that time a temple of Jahveh in Jerusalem, it could hardly make a claim to the respect and to the gifts of neighbouring kings when standing near it were temples of their own deities, Chemosh, Moloch, Astarte and other gods (1 Kings vi. 5-7). At this period Jahveh was not thought of as universal but national, the God of Israel. When David was driven to take refuge in Moab he had left the inheritance of Jahveh and felt bidden to "serve other gods" (1 Sam. xxvi. 20). While there he was in the land of Chemosh. The whole range of ideas underlying vv. 29 and 31 of the Psalm was quite foreign to the thought of the period of David and Solomon. These ideas could only become possible after the law of Deut. had been published and the reforms of Josiah had taken effect, nor perhaps even then until the conceptions of a universal God and of an exclusive central sanctuary had become rooted in the consciousness of the Judean community.

(b) The title prefixed to the Psalm cannot be adduced as a proof of authorship. It is as follows¹: "The Precentor's—David's—a song for the harp." If the *Lamed* here is to be taken as indicating authorship² it would apply to the Precentor as much as to David, and being applied to both can hardly mean the authorship of either. The same combination with other descriptive words is prefixed to a large number of Psalms, and we also have "The Precentor's—Korah's sons'," "The Precentor's—Asaph's," at the head of many other Psalms. The explanation of these phenomena would seem to be that before the compilation and arrangement of the Psalter in its present form there were probably several collections or little Psalters known as "David's" containing Psalms of various dates which, at the time when these small Psalters were compiled, were supposed by the collector to have been composed by David. Upon what tradition or upon what conjecture this supposition was based we are not in a position to say. Presumably there were also similar small collections of Psalms known as "Korah's Sons'," "Asaph's" and so on³. At a later period a leading musician seems to have compiled for use in the Temple a "Precentor's Psalter," making use not only of the Psalters known as "David's"

¹ לַמְנִצֵּחַ לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר.

² See *Ges. K.* 129. c.

³ It would appear from 2 Chr. xxix. 30 that "David's" and "Asaph's" Psalters were extant in the Chronicler's day.

but of "Korah's," "Asaph's" and other sources, and indicating at the head of each Psalm the collection or source from which it was taken. This "Precentor's" Psalter formed the basis of the present Psalter and around it the final editor grouped all the materials collected by him, carrying on the old headings and marking what he took from the Precentor¹. If this can be regarded as a reasonable explanation of the phenomena, the prefix means that the Psalm was comprised in one of "David's" Psalters from which it was transferred by the Precentor to his book. It cannot be taken as conclusive evidence of authorship if it be any real evidence at all, and the question of the period of the Psalm will have to be determined by other considerations.

(c) It has been thought that the presence of "princes of Zebulun and princes of Naphtali" in the procession described in this Psalm must fix its authorship in a period when Israel and Judah were politically united and therefore not later than the reign of Solomon². Curiously, the same inference leads Duhm to fix the authorship in the very late period when Judah and Galilee were again politically united. We do not think that any such conclusions are to be drawn from this circumstance. After the fall of Samaria a large population must have remained in the old tribal seats of Israel. We do not know the number carried away by Tiglath Pileser (2 Kings xv. 29, 30), but we have an actual statement by Sargon of the extent of his deportation: "27,290 of its (Samaria's) inhabitants I carried into captivity... the rest of them I allowed to retain their possessions³." Of the large number who were left in the land there must have been many who desired to cleave to the worship of Jahveh and to frequent His sanctuary at Jerusalem⁴. We are not left to conjecture on this matter. The invitation of Hezekiah to the Northern tribes to attend the Passover was responded to by pious individuals from no less than five tribes—Asher, Manasseh, Zebulun, Ephraim and Issachar (2 Chr. xxx. 10, 18). Later, after the fall of Jerusalem, eighty pious men from Shechem, Shiloh and Samaria—all old sacred cities and rivals of Jeru-

¹ See Driver, *Introd.* 1st ed. 359. Robertson-Smith, *O. T. Jew. Church*, Lect. 7. Briggs, *Psalms*, i. lxi, lxiii, xci. Cheyne, *Psalms*, 2nd ed. i. lv.

² "Und hält uns nicht v. 28 diessseit der Reichspaltungs fest?" Delitzsch, p. 446.

³ Schrader, *Das A. T. u. die Keilins.* 2nd ed. p. 272. Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 101.

⁴ See Ewald, *Geschichte*, E. T. v. p. 97.

saalem—came in funeral garb to offer frankincense and mourn over her ruined temple (Jer. xli. 5–8). Men from Bethel, the former great metropolis of the calf-worship (Am. vii. 12 f.), who might have been thought to be steeped in idolatry, were carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar and returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii. 1, 2, 28; Neh. vii. 6, 7, 32). These men for long years kept a fast in the month of Ab in memory of the destruction of the temple and sent a deputation to the priests and prophets at Jerusalem to learn if they were to continue this mourning now that the temple was being restored (Zech. vii. 2–4). About the same time the Samaritans themselves approached Zerubbabel with a request that they might be allowed to participate in the building of the temple (Ezra iv. 1 f.). Ezekiel in his ideal reconstruction of Holy City, temple, and nation makes an allotment of territory to each of the twelve tribes (Ez. xlviⁱⁱⁱ)¹. At the inauguration of the temple twelve sacrifices were offered for all Israel according to the number of the tribes of Israel (Ezra vi. 17). A Post-Captivity Psalm states as a well-known fact that the tribes of Jah go up to Jerusalem to praise the name of Jahveh (Ps. cxxii. 3, 4). Even later in the times of Herod a prophetess of the tribe of Asher was living in the temple (Luke ii. 36). These facts, which are probably typical of many others, render it neither unlikely nor incongruous that, at any time after the fall of Samaria, some pious men from Northern tribes should be seen walking in a sacred procession in Jerusalem. This fact had no political import, it was religious sympathy that brought these men of Northern tribes to the temple. There is nothing in this allusion to confine us to the time of Solomon.

These considerations seem to make it unlikely if not impossible that this Psalm could be composed by David or in a Davidic atmosphere.

Some of the above considerations will also apply to the suggestion of Hitzig that the Psalm celebrates the war of Jehoram and Jehoshaphat against Moab (2 Kings iii). There was not much in this event to call forth a Judean song of exultant joy. The campaign failed, the allies had to retreat, Moab was not subdued². Is it to be supposed that the two

¹ See a sketch-plan of this ideal distribution of the land, *Speaker's Com.* vol. vi. p. 206.

² See Kittel, *Gesch.* 2nd ed. ii. p. 362.

kings (one of them a worshipper of Baal), on their return from this unsuccessful expedition, joined in a joyous procession to the temple of Jahveh at Jerusalem? It is not credible that at this period any poet of Judah could express a confident anticipation that, for the sake of the temple, kings would bring presents to Jerusalem. Mesha king of Moab ascribed the repulse of the allies to his national god Chemosh, and records that he had captured sacred vessels of Jahveh and dragged them before Chemosh¹. Such an aspiration as the Psalm expresses was not possible in this age of hostile neighbours and national or tribal divinities. But apart from this difficulty the whole tone of the Psalm is quite inappropriate to the return from an expedition which if not disgraceful was entirely unsuccessful, to say nothing of the very curious fact that no allusion is made to the presence of either king.

We now turn to the very late dates suggested by Olshausen and by Duhm which are not only improbable in themselves but most unlikely if not impossible for reasons arising out of the history of the Canon of Scripture. The period selected by Olshausen was one of confused war (with changing alliances and varying fortunes) in which Seleucid kings and satraps, the pretender Alexander Balas (d. B.C. 146), and Ptolemy Philomētor were engaged². It was a period of great success and prosperity to the Jews under Jonathan the Maccabean. This crafty and unscrupulous man had little of the religious fervour of his brother Judas. By courage and skill in war, by judiciously changing sides and selling himself to the highest bidder, he obtained not only the position of High Priest but of Governor of Judea and parts of Samaria. The restored Jewish state never enjoyed so strong and desirable a position as under Jonathan and his brother Simon who succeeded him as High Priest and Governor. But this period does not satisfy the religious aspirations of the Psalm. Could the Psalmist expect that Seleucid kings like Demetrius Nicator or Demetrius Sotēr would bring gifts to Jahveh for the sake of His temple at Jerusalem when there was actually a Seleucid garrison in the

¹ See lines 9, 14, 18, 19 of the Mesha stone in Burney, *Notes on Kings*, 371 and note, *ib.* 272.

² See 1 Macc. x, xi. Ewald, *Gesch. E. T.* v. 327 f. Wellhausen, *Gesch.* 5th ed. pp. 270-4.

citadel there? Anything they or Ptolemy or Alexander offered to Jonathan had no religious object—it was to secure his services as a partisan leader. The poet could hardly have prayed “Rebuke the wild beast of the reed” when Ptolemy had been the ally of Jonathan. And a prayer that Jahveh would scatter people that delighted in war was not a likely aspiration at a time when such a description applied so perfectly to Jonathan himself. When the history of this period is examined, its atmosphere cannot be brought into relation with the range of thought of this Psalm or with its religious hopes and visions.

Similar considerations would apply with perhaps even greater force to the application of this Psalm by Duhm to Alexander Jannæus (d. B.C. 81) and his warfare with Ptolemy Lathyrus and the Nabatean Arabs¹. There is no trace of religious feeling or motive about this cruel and dissolute warrior, and throughout his career he was bitterly opposed by the Pharisees, the only party among the Jews of his time who were at all in harmony with the religious thought of this Psalm. Jannæus was supported by the Sadducees², but we are unable to think it possible that this fine religious poem could emanate from that cold, sceptical, and worldly school.

But in fact these late dates of composition (B.C. 146 or 81) cannot be brought into harmony with well-known facts in the history of the Jewish Canon of Scripture. From the preface by Jesus the son of Sirach to his grandfather's book Ecclesiasticus (B.C. 132) it is certain that the Jewish Scriptures in their three divisions of the Law, the Prophets and “the other Books of the Fathers” had then been translated into Greek, and this implies a completed Canon to which no further writing could be added³. It is in any event certain that the complete Psalter, as we have it now, lay before the Greek interpreters and was translated by them⁴. For the Psalter in Greek is divided into the same five books as the Hebrew text, and the doxologies marking the ends of the first four books (Ps. xli. 14, lxxii. 19, lxxxix. 53, cvi. 48) are translated, as are the words at the end of book 2: “Ended are the hymns of David the son of Jesse.” And when it was

¹ Ewald, *op. cit.* 368 f. Wellhausen, *op. cit.* 282–6.

² Wellhausen, p. 298 and n.

³ For the proof of this see Cannon, *Song of Songs* (Camb. 1913), pp. 80–82.

⁴ Cornill, *Einleit.* 4th ed. p. 227. Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch*, p. 746.

desired to add to the collection a Psalm which the translators believed to be by David himself it was not incorporated in the completed Psalter but placed at the end with a note stating that it was "outside the number," that is the traditional and recognized canonical number¹. If a Psalm which they believed to be from the hand of David could not be taken into the sacred collection by these translators, the Hebrew Psalter at that time was not only complete but must have acquired what we can only call Canonical Authority and a sense of sanctity. It is simply incredible that a Psalm about Ptolemy and Alexander Balas, only just written, would be received into such a collection; it is absolutely impossible that a Psalm about Jannæus could be interpolated into it fifty years after the translation was completed.

But this is not all. The Greek translators found this Psalm already provided with a title which, as we have seen, appears to have implied that it had formed part of "David's" Psalter and also of the "Precentor's" Psalter. It is true that they did not understand this title and translated it by a guess²: but they had it before them here as in many other Psalms. Now a new Psalm written *cir.* B.C. 146 would not have been furnished in the Hebrew with such a title, as it could not have been included in either of the older Psalters referred to, still less in both—there was not time for the process. The fact that the Psalm has this heading shows that it was old enough to have its origin forgotten and to be attributed to David. If its origin had been known to be as recent as B.C. 146 it would have been also known that it was not David's, and, if it had been translated into Greek and added to the Psalter at all, it would certainly have been placed "outside the (canonical) number." These considerations would not appear to render impossible the presence in the Psalter of Psalms of the early Maccabean period, but they make it extremely unlikely that many will be found there³. It will be observed that the three Psalms

¹ Οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυὶδ καὶ ἐξῶθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ὅτε ἐμονομάχησε τῷ Γολιάδ. See König, *Einleit.* p. 406.

² Εἰς τὸ τέλος. τῷ Δαυὶδ ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς. See Cheyne, *Psalms*, 2nd ed. i. xxxviii. In Hab. iii. 19 the Greek translator made a different guess, τοῦ νικῆσαι.

³ "Die Mehrzahl der Psalmen oder gar den ganzen Psalter aus den makkabä-ische Zeit herzuleiten ist eine ganz maaslose Uebertreibung." Cornill, *Einleit.* 226.

which even by conservative critics¹ are assigned to this period, Pss. xlv, lxxiv, lxxix², have no reference to David in their headings, and one only, xlv, is "Precentor's." It is also noticeable that these three Psalms are not Maccabean, but *Pre-Maccabean*. They have no relation to the heroic deeds of Matthias and Judas, but (if they belong to this period at all) they depict the sorrowful times before the national upheaval, i.e. before B.C. 168. There was therefore just time for these Psalms to be taken into the Psalter before it was translated into Greek. It is however by no means certain that these Psalms belong to this period. They are equally appropriate to the terrible scenes which took place in Jerusalem and Judea under Artaxerxes Ochus, which we shall refer to in a subsequent page. This is indeed a more likely date. 1 Macc. vii. 17 quotes directly from Ps. lxxix. 2, 3 as Scripture³, which would hardly be likely if the Psalm was only just written. But whether or not there are in the Psalter a few Psalms of Pre-Maccabean date, we are satisfied for the reasons given above that the dates given by Olshausen and by Duhm to this Psalm are not possible.

Setting aside then those periods which for various reasons do not seem possible dates, some others must now be considered to which those reasons do not apply. And first the opinion of Briggs that the Psalm belongs to the late Persian period, when Persia and Egypt were at war, about B.C. 360-350. We are quite unable to see in this war between Artaxerxes Ochus and the last Egyptian king Nectanebo⁴ any event which would call forth a song of deliverance and hope from a Judean poet. What did it matter to the little intermediate state if Ochus was defeated in 351, or that he obtained a final victory over Egypt in 346? Neither event made much difference to the Jews, it was only a question who was to be their master. Syria could not be free while these great kingdoms existed. And indeed tradition assigns to this period events terrible to the Jews⁵. It is related that they joined in the revolt of Phenicia against

¹ Driver, *Introd.* 1st ed. p. 364. Perowne, Jennings and Lowe, etc.

² Wellhausen adds Pss. lxxxiii and cxlix, *Gesch.* 238, n. 3.

³ See Cheyne, *Psalms*, 2nd ed. i. xx. 5, lxii. 2. κατὰ τοὺς λόγους οὗς ἐγραψεν.

⁴ Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* iii. 750 f. Rawlinson, *Monarchies*, 4th ed. iii. 509 f.

⁵ Ewald, *Gesch.* v. 206. Wellhausen, *Gesch.* 192.

Ochus, and that as a punishment a number of them were exiled to Hyrcania on the southern shore of the Caspian sea. It is further related¹ that the Persian satrap Bagoses had a purpose to substitute for the High Priest Johanan his brother Jesus, that there was a quarrel in the temple, that Johanan slew Jesus, and that the Persian satrap pressed into the temple and oppressed the Jews and exacted a special tribute for seven years. No event in the reign of Ochus can be pointed to which can lead us to think of it as a time of rejoicing in Judea, or as suitable to produce a song of triumphant joy and hope.

Even less satisfactory seems the theory of Hupfeld-Nowack and Reuss that the Psalm owes its origin to the conflicts of the Ptolemies and Seleucids for the possession of Palestine². It is admitted that it is quite impossible to identify the particular event which called forth the song, and it is difficult in considering this and some other theories to understand why the Jews should utter such a pæan of joy over victories in which they had no part and from which they had nothing to gain³. In the complicated series of events which happened in this lengthy struggle we find few which directly affected the Judean state. In the early stages of the war (B.C. 321) Ptolemy Sotër took Jerusalem on the Sabbath day and carried away a large number of captives, who were subsequently restored by Ptolemy Philadelphus. But generally speaking the great battles and sieges of this war were far from Judea, and probably it did not matter much to the little state which of the great powers prevailed. The Jews had become accustomed to foreign rule and remained in the same condition when its name was changed. They bowed to the inevitable and did not seek to intervene on either side, satisfied if their little commonwealth remained undisturbed. In this state of things it is hard to think that any victory obtained by either party could cause them much pleasure or call forth lyric expressions of joy. The early successes of

¹ Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 7. 1. It has been suggested (Hoonacker, Schweich Lectures, p. 43. Ewald, *Gesch.* v. 206) that this event took place under Artaxerxes Mnemon. But it seems more likely (see Wellhausen, *Gesch.* 192) that the acts of oppression mentioned above have some relation to one another.

² As to these wars see Dan. xi. 2-20, Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 1-4, Ewald, *op. cit.* v. 225 f., Wellhausen, *op. cit.* 228-235.

³ "Wahrlich (es ist) kein Krieg bei welchem Israel selbständig handelnd theilhaftig gewesen wäre." Reuss (quot. Olshausen, *Com.* 286).

the Ptolemies and the final triumphs of Antiochus were only interesting to the Jews as deciding who was to be their overlord, and to whom they were to pay tribute. Victories in this war were not triumphs of Jahveh and His chosen people over His enemies, and there could be very little incentive to celebrate them in sacred song. The advocates of this date think that the Psalm expresses a spirit of misery and depression caused by the sufferings inflicted upon Judea by the hordes of mercenaries engaged in this war. We must confess to being unable to find this tone in the Psalm. The Psalms which describe sufferings endured in the times of Ochus or Antiochus Epiphanes know how to convey such an impression of misery, but surely this must be mainly regarded as a song of joy, and can hardly be attributed to any period on the basis of being a song of misery. For every reason, this is not a suitable or a likely period.

No difficulties of this kind stand in the way of Wellhausen's date, which therefore merits careful examination. He states it thus: "The orphans and widows are the forsaken and prisoners, they are Jews dwelling apart among the heathen (in Bashan, *vv.* 15, 22) and oppressed by them, they are rescued by a Jewish army and, with the exception of some self-willed individuals who prefer to dwell among the heathen, are brought to Jerusalem. The position is that of 1 Macc. v. 11¹." This date as we have seen is a possible one and the theory is very attractive, as it seems to connect the Psalm with a piece of authentic history. Unfortunately when examined this theory breaks down. According to the Psalm it is the *enemies* of God who are to be brought back from Bashan². In *v.* 21, God will smite the head of His enemies. Then follows *v.* 22, in which the Lord declared "from Bashan I will fetch back, I will fetch them back from depths of the sea." Neither on the mountain heights of Bashan nor in the depths of the sea shall the enemies of God escape His vengeance. It is poetry, hyperbole, and not a reference to history. The passage is very like and is most probably reminiscent of a passage in Amos:

If they dig through into Sheol from thence my hand will take them.

And if they go up to the heavens from thence I will bring them down.

¹ Wellhausen-Furness, 191.

² "Whoever wrote מְבַשֵּׁן אֲשֵׁיב had in his mind a divine judgment against the foes of Israel." Cheyne, *Psalms*, i. 294.

And if they hide themselves at the head of Carmel from thence I will search and take them.

And if they conceal themselves from my eyes in the bed of the sea, there I will command the serpent to bite them. (Am. ix. 2, 3.)

There is therefore no allusion to the campaign of Judas in Gilead—and the mention of orphans and widows, solitary ones and captives, in the Psalm has nothing to do with Bashan—it should rather be regarded as expressing the general course of Divine Providence (like Ps. cxlvi. 7-9). We are therefore unable to see in this Psalm any allusion to the period of Judas the Maccabee or any indication that it was composed in that period.

Having considered those various schemes put forward by expositors we now proceed to examine some phenomena of the Psalm itself which may shed further light on its origin and force.

(a) It springs from some recent triumph over the enemies of Jahveh, which cannot mean anything else but the enemies of Jahveh's people—the Jews. God arises, His enemies disperse, His haters flee, they are driven like smoke, they melt like wax, the righteous rejoice. Deliverances of Jahveh's people in the past are thankfully recalled, deliverances in the desert of Sinai, in the wars of conquest, triumphal entries into Sion. God is *to us* a God of salvation—a God of deliverances—He will smite the head of His (our) enemies and bring them back from distant, inaccessible places for *us* to punish them. May God confirm what He has wrought *for us*. The majesty of God is *over Israel*. He gives strength and all power to *the people* (us)!

It seems quite certain that such thoughts are only appropriate to some triumph of Judah. Some success, some great advantage or blessing or deliverance from peril has happened to the community of Jahveh, which is suitably acknowledged by a procession to the temple on Sion. The words and thoughts of this Psalm are not satisfied by victories or triumphs of heathen powers in which Judah is more or less remotely interested. They are quite inappropriate to battles of Cambyses or Ochus against Egyptian or Phenician kings, or to wars between Ptolemy and Seleucus or their descendants. It can only be interpreted with success by reference to events which were real triumphs of Judah over foreign foes or domestic rebels—enemies of Jahveh and His people. It is in this way alone that we may

hope to find a solution of its undoubted obscurities and difficulties. This dominant factor of interpretation—that the Psalm celebrates a triumph of Jahveh's people over Jahveh's enemies is likely to lead to much more fruitful results than the framing of systems based on casual or incidental allusions, some of which systems we have seen reasons for finding little suitable or satisfactory in themselves.

(b) Further light on the Psalm may be gained from a peculiarity of its composition. "It is as if the poet felt himself incapable of producing so lofty a song entirely from his own power, since the finest and most powerful passages in it are (so to speak) an anthology taken from ancient songs, which partly we find already in the O.T. and partly we must conclude were once extant. The whole is rather put together out of a series of fine old passages than as a new work with a fixed plan, and since many of the old passages are very mutilated (probably because they are well known to the singers) the explanation is often difficult¹." The following are the principal places which illustrate this system of composition². There may be other allusions, but we regard these as certain:

v. 1	quotes or is reminiscent of	Num. x. 35.
4	" "	Deut. xxxiii. 26.
"	" "	Ex. xv. 3.
7	" "	Jud. v. 4, 5, 6.
8	" "	Hab. iii. 12.
11	" "	Unknown.
13	" "	Jud. v. 16.
14	" "	Unknown.
15	" "	Unknown.
17	" "	Deut. xxxiii. 2.
"	" "	Num. x. 36.
"	" "	Hab. iii. 8.
18	" "	Unknown.
20	" "	Hab. iii. 8.
21	" "	Num. xxiv. 17.
"	" "	Hab. iii. 13.
22	" "	Amos ix. 2, 3.
24	" "	Hab. iii. 6.
33	" "	Deut. xxx. 26.
"	" "	" x. 14.

¹ Ewald, *Dichter des A. B.* 3rd ed. i. 2. 417.

² As to Hab. iii. see Hupfeld-Nowack, ii. 135.

It will be found when we examine them later that the quotations whose sources are unknown to us are like the others taken from various periods of national history.

It will be observed that not only all the sources whose origin we can trace but also those extracts which are of unknown origin relate to triumphs or deliverances of *Israel*. The poet, whose mind seems to be full of these old songs, recalls in quotations the great deliverance from Egypt, the passage through the desert, wars with the Canaanites, the settlement of the tribes in their locations, the victories of David, the triumphant entry of the Ark into Sion, the oracle of Amos against the enemies of God, Habakkuk's lyric vision of vengeance on the Chaldeans. This is not a vain display of historical lore or a mere taste for quoting old national poetry. It has an object: the deliverances wrought by Jahveh in the past are meant to illustrate and lead up to the happy deliverance which the poet celebrates in the present. These citations of poetry all bear out the central truth of our Psalm:

God is to us a God of deliverances.

God will smite the head of his enemies.

as He did in the past.

It does not satisfy this historic background any more than it suits the present joy of the Psalm to bring it into relation with conflicts of foreign kings. It must, like these great lyric odes of the past, celebrate a triumph of some kind for Jahveh's people over His (and their) enemies. It is more than ever apparent how precarious every scheme of interpretation must be which rests upon some detail in an ancient and obscure quotation. Thus Wellhausen's theory rests entirely upon two allusions to "Bashan," one of which is quoted from an old lost song, and the other occurs in a paraphrase of a stanza in Amos. Duhm¹ collects from an old lyric fragment about "snow on Salmon" the somewhat extensive deduction that the Psalm must have been written at a time when Shechem had been subjugated by Judea. Such inferences would perhaps not have been drawn had it been better remembered that the poet was quoting snatches from old ballads,

Of old forgotten far off things
And battles long ago.

¹ *Psalmen*, p. 174.

and in which the sense of many allusions has been obscured by time.

(c) The author of this Psalm moved in the same range of ideas and was animated by the same glowing hopes as Deutero-Isaiah and the Post-Captivity Prophets. Thus:

(1) The great Captivity Prophet uttered in several places a call to "cast up" in the desert a highway for Jahveh and His people to return to Sion (Is. xl. 3, lvii. 14, lxii. 10, cf. xxxv. 8). This is echoed by the Psalmist (using the same verb):

Cast up a highway for him who rides through the deserts. *v.* 4.

(2) The prophet dwells on the goodness of God in releasing prisoners out of captivity (Is. xlii. 7, xlix. 9, lxi. 1) and the Psalmist utters the same idea:

He leads out prisoners into prosperity. *v.* 6.

(3) The prophet in lyric rapture foresees the services of foreign kings to the restored community and the continued flow of the wealth of all nations to Sion the city of Jahveh whose gates shall be open day and night to receive this wealth and the homage of kings (Is. xlix. 22, lv. 5, lx. *passim*). So Haggai had prophesied that the desirable things of all nations should come to the restored temple (ii. 2) and Zechariah that the wealth of all the heathen round about Jerusalem should be gathered together (xiv. 14). In the same spirit our Psalmist writes:

For the sake of thy temple which is over Jerusalem

To thee shall kings bring gifts. *v.* 29.

(4) The prophet foresaw embassies from Egypt and Kush (Ethiopia) arriving at Jerusalem with gifts, and worshipping Jahveh with sacrifices and vows (Is. xviii. 7, xix. 21, xlv. 14). The Psalmist has the same vision:

In haste will men come from Egypt;

Kush will quickly stretch forth her hand to God. *v.* 31.

The Psalm in fact contains "joyful outpourings of the cheerful mood, filled with a wide outlook, of those days of a temple renewing its youth, a clear echo of the great prophetic voice, Is. xl-lxvi¹." The Psalmist, inspired by and echoing such ideals, must have lived in a period when they were still operative and seemed likely to be realised, a time of hope, not a time of despair, a time when a deliverance had recently been experienced, and when a bright future could still be anticipated.

¹ Ewald, *Dichter*, i. 2. 415.

The consideration of all the phenomena we have just passed in review leads to the conclusion that the Psalm celebrates some happy event which occurred in the reconstruction of the Jewish community after the first return from exile in Babylon. This is in general the view of Ewald who suggests that the Psalm was composed for the consecration of the restored temple and sung on that occasion. This view is not in itself unlikely, but there is nothing to support it in the very meagre record we possess of the ceremony on this occasion (Ezra vi. 16, 17), the only details mentioned being sacrifices on a large scale, no allusion being made to any *procession* or to festal music. Now later on in the history (Neh. xii), in the period of Ezra Nehemiah and Artaxerxes Longimanus, we have a detailed account of a procession with music and song on the occasion of the inauguration of the walls of Jerusalem. As we think this the most likely period for the composition of our Psalms we propose to examine this subject in some detail.

The Chaldeans had made a thorough and systematic destruction of the walls and gates of Jerusalem (Jer. li. 13, Lam. ii. 8, 9). The effect of this was almost to prevent her from being a city at all. "A town in antiquity first became a town in the true sense of the word when she obtained her walls¹." The returned Jews had no security in their city against open enemy or secret traitor, they could not enforce the prescriptions of their sacred law or keep out undesirable heathens. To the Prophet of the Captivity a walled city was to be looked forward to—"Aliens shall build thy walls," "Thou shalt call thy walls Salvation and thy gates Praise" (Is. lx. 10-18)—and a pious writer adding an appendix to an older Psalm voiced the aspiration of many hearts as he cried:

Be pleased to shew kindness to Sion:

Build the walls of Jerusalem (Ps. li. 20)².

Animated by such feelings the Jews, some time before the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B.C. 445), began to build the walls and dig out the foundations (Ezra iv. 12). Complaints were made to the Persian king by his officials Rechum and Shimshai and the work was ordered to be stopped (Ezra iv. 12f.). It appears that the work done up to that time on the fortifications was destroyed, the gates burned, and the

¹ Stade, *Geschichte*, II. 160.

² See Cheyne, *Psalms*, I. 230.

old ruins of the walls which still remained levelled to the ground (Ezra iv. 23, Neh. i. 3). This was effected by the Persian officials who came in haste to Jerusalem with an army¹ for the purpose. Such was the sorrowful news brought to Nehemiah at the Court of Susa by his brother, and the building of these walls was from that day the preoccupation of his life. It is almost the only theme of the memoirs written by himself (Neh. i-vii. 5, xii. 27-xiii. 31). Backed by the power of the Great King and helped by the grants of timber from the royal forests he went to Jerusalem and began bravely on the work. The physical difficulties were very great (Neh. ii. 14, iv. 2), and in addition he had to face a formidable opposition from a confederation of heathen enemies backed by traitors in the city.

At the head of this combination was Sanballat of Beth-horon, a heathen of Assyrian origin². This man not only occupied a most important strategic position, but his territory formed an *enclave* in the middle of the territory occupied by the Jews³. His very presence there was an annoyance and a danger. With him was a contingent from Ashdod. We do not know how far this city had recovered since its conquest by Psammetichus who is said to have besieged it for 29 years⁴ (B.C. *cir.* 630). Jer. (xxv. 20) speaks of it as "the remnant of Ashdod." Many of the Jews had married Ashdodite wives and the children spoke half in the speech of Ashdod and could not speak in the Jews' language (Neh. xii. 23, 24)⁵. So whatever the population of Ashdod was, they were in a position to supply open combatants and secret traitors.

Other contingents came from over the Jordan. Tobiah, who seems to have been a freed slave elevated to be a Persian official⁶, brought a body of men from Ammon. They were old enemies of Israel. They had made raids into Palestine and

¹ בָּאֲדָרֶת וְהִיל. See Oettli, *Com. Nehemiah*, pp. 176-7. Wellhausen, *Gesch.* 173-4. "Dass die Mauer auf Befehl des Artaxerxes selber zerstört sei lässt sich schwer glauben da Neh. von einem solchen Befehl nichts weiss." *Ib.* n. 2.

² The name is Assyro-Babylonian, *Sinballit* (Sin—the moongod—gives life). Schrader, *Die Keilins. und das A. T.* 2nd ed. 382. The LXX. Σαναβαλλάτ seems to be the correct form, *ib.*

³ Stade, *Gesch.* ii. 112 and the map.

⁴ Herod. ii. 157.

⁵ See Macalister, *Philistines*, p. 66.

⁶ מֹכֶלֶת הָעֶבֶר, Neh. ii. 10, 19. Ewald, *Gesch.* v. 153.

been driven back by Ehud (Jud. iii. 13), Jephthah (Jud. x. 8 f.), Saul (1 Sam. xi), David (2 Sam. viii. 12) and Jotham (2 Chr. xxvii. 5). Amos denounces them for atrocious cruelty in Gilead in order to extend their territory (Am. i. 13, see Zeph. ii. 9). And Ezekiel in distant exile heard of their shouts of joy over the ruined temple, the desolate land and the captive people (Ez. xxv. 3). At the time of the fall of Jerusalem they were occupying the whole territory of the tribe of Gad (Jer. xlix. 1), and after that event their king had instigated one Ishmael to murder the governor Gedaliah, and had found him refuge when he had done so (Jer. xl. 14, xli. 16). Tobiah was the more dangerous because of his connections in Jerusalem, both he and his son having Jewish wives and keeping up a correspondence with Jewish nobles (Neh. vi. 17). Further, some of the Jews had married Ammonite wives (Neh. xiii. 23), so that the danger of secret treachery was very serious.

Lastly, Gashmu, an Arab Sheik, brought a force of Bedawin Arabs from the South or East, a race who were always ready for any opportunity of war or plunder. The Arabians were at this time a growing power, having driven the Edomites from their seats in Petra and elsewhere by the time of Malachi (i. 1-5)¹. They were in a position to inflict much injury on Judea.

Out of these various but dangerous elements was formed "the Army of Samaria" (Neh. iii. 34); "And they all conspired together to go and make war against Jerusalem" (Neh. iv. 2).

The danger was great and the task of Nehemiah seemed wellnigh impossible. He had to face an army, to guard against treachery among his own people, and all the while to carry on the very toilsome work of building the wall. But his faith and courage prevailed against enemies and traitors. He took sound military measures to guard against attack or surprise—the builders worked under arms—plots to terrify him or seize his person failed. His example and his personality inspired the people to keep the work going without interruption. The wall was finished in fifty-two days, the gates were fixed and guarded, and Sanballat and his motley army quitted the scene, having accomplished nothing.

It was a great achievement and an event of much importance to Judea. For seventy years the restored community had had

¹ *Enc. Bib.* art. *Nabatheans*.

no security against enemies or traitors or heathen immigrants. Now the city was safe. It had an extended boundary¹ and an increased population. Every tenth man had to come from the country into the town, and many upon whom the lot did not fall came of their own accord. The building of the wall inspired fear in their enemies and respect in the surrounding nations. But to Ezra and Nehemiah and the pious men of the nation the wall meant more than this. It afforded a chance of enforcing the sacred law with greater strictness. While heathen foreigners of every sort could come and go as they liked, forming friendships and intermarrying with Jewish families, a laxity of practice amounting almost to apostasy was likely to spring up. Some facts which occurred soon after this time will illustrate the importance of the city being walled. The Ammonite Tobiah had actually been given a room within the temple to live in. Nehemiah turned him and his furniture out, and was in a position to keep him out (Neh. xiii. 8). A grandson of the High Priest Eliashib had married a daughter of Sanballat of Beth-horon. Nehemiah drove him out of the town (*ib.* v. 28). The Sabbath was not strictly kept; it had become a market day on which country people and Tyrian hucksters brought their wares to the city. Nehemiah shut the gates of the city from Friday evening to Sabbath evening and stopped this profane traffic (*ib.* vv. 19 f.). In these and no doubt many other cases the walling in of the city made it possible to keep heathen influences away from the people, and as the Jewish saying expresses it "to make a hedge round the Law."

The joy of the people at the happy completion of the wall and the gates found expression in a festal procession of which the Governor in his memoirs has left this account:

And at the initiation² of the Wall of Jerusalem they sought out the Levites from all their places to bring them to Jerusalem to celebrate the initiation and joy-feast with praise-choirs, song, cymbals, lyres and harps. And the sons of the singers were assembled from the plain round Jerusalem and from the villages of the Netophathites and from Beth-Gilgal and from the fields of Geba and Asmaveth, for the singers had built themselves villages around Jerusalem. And the Priests and the Levites purified them-

¹ Stade, *Gesch.* II. 167 and the map.

² מִנְחָה means the bringing into use of a new thing, as Deut. xx. 5, Ps. xxx. title.

selves and purified the people and the Gates and the Wall. And I brought the Princes of Judah up on the Wall, and I established two great praise-choirs and processions¹ [the first went] to the right on the Wall towards the dung (gate). And behind went Hoshiah and half the Princes of Judah, and Azariah Ezra and Meshullam Judah and Benjamin and Shemaiah and Jeremiah. And some of the sons of the priests with trumpets [list of names]—and his brothers [more names] with song-instruments of David² the man of God, and Ezra the scribe in front of them. And over the Well Gate straightforward they mounted the steps of the City of David by the steps up the wall over David's house to the Water Gate eastward. And the second praise-choir went the opposite way and I and half the people went after them upon the Wall over the Furnace Tower and as far as the Broad Wall, and over the Ephraim Gate and as far as the Old Gate and over the Fish Gate and the Tower of Hananel and the Hundred Tower and as far as the Sheep Gate, and they stopped at the Prison Gate. Then the two praise-choirs took their stand in the House of God—so did I and half the prefects with me. And the priests [names] with trumpets, and [more names] and the singers uttered sound and Israchiah was the conductor. And great sacrifices were offered that day and men rejoiced because God had given them great joy—also the women and children rejoiced, and the joy of Jerusalem was heard far and wide (Neh. xii. 27–43).

We suggest that the author of Psalm lxviii was one of the men that rejoiced, and that he was an eye-witness of this ceremony at the point where the two praise-choirs met and entered the temple. In v. 24 he says that *men* (he and others in a crowd) *saw the processions of God into the sanctuary*, and he uses the plural because there were two processions. This imposing sight and the thought of recent perils and recent deliverances led him to reflect on other deliverances celebrated in ancient song. Thus came the inspiration of this noble poem, which was to be a worthy memorial of a day never to be forgotten, perhaps the greatest day Judea had experienced since Zerubbabel and the first returning exiles had entered the ruined city.

Brief as is the reference to the procession in the Psalm we hope to show in a later page that it has many points of contact with the detailed story of Nehemiah. But here we would rather lay stress on this one notable feature. The Psalm must have been written on the occasion of a real important procession³,

¹ תַּהֲלֻכֹת, lit. "goings," equivalent to הֶלְיֻכֹת, Ps. lxviii. 29, Hab. iii. 6. The routes of the two processions are shown on the map. Stade, *Gesch.* II. 112.

² Comp. Amos vi. 5.

³ See Olshausen, Hupfeld-Nowack and Briggs, *Comms.* on v. 24.

and here is an actual important procession at a period suitable to the thoughts and ideas of the Psalm, and on an occasion of sufficient importance to warrant lyric celebration. On the only other occasions at this period worthy to be so celebrated, the foundation stone laying of the temple (Ezra iii. 8-13) and its consecration (Ezra vi. 16, 17), there is no mention of any procession. On this occasion there is, and we seem here to have something more than a mere coincidence. Both documents belong to the same period, both are full of gratitude for deliverance, and pervaded by joy and hope, both find the expression of their joy in the description of a procession which certainly took place. It is surely not unreasonable to think that it is the same procession. Such a view has at least this advantage over some other schemes—it rests on a historic fact. We do not postulate a hypothetical procession deduced from the words of the Psalm, but we deal with one which really took place and of which we have good contemporary evidence that it is a fact, and we cannot help feeling that we can explain the Psalm with much more confidence when we are able to base our comments on a historic event as a starting point.

The dating of the Psalm, *cir.* B.C. 445, receives support from some considerations of an entirely different character from those which we have been discussing—those arising out of the history of the period. The rule of the earlier Achaemenid kings over Judea was on the whole a mild one. There were taxes it is true (Neh. v. 4), but we do not hear at this time of oppression. Above all there was peace and protection from Egypt. The Jews enjoyed for about two hundred years the peace and repose which had been established for this part of the Persian Empire through the subjugation of Egypt by Cambyses¹. And Artaxerxes had been specially kind both to Ezra (Ezra vii. 11-26) and to Nehemiah. Without his support and his gifts the walls would never have been rebuilt. No Jew of this period could have wished to see his mild and beneficent rule displaced by that of Egypt. But in 460 there had been a most serious revolt of Inaros an Egyptian king, assisted by Athenian fleets and armies, against the rule of the Great King. Many reverses were sustained by the Persian forces, and it was only by

¹ See Holtzmann, *supp.* Stade, *Gesch.* ii. 273.

immense armaments and after long drawn out fighting that the supremacy of Persia was restored (B.C. 455). Athens ceased for the time to be a danger by the Peace of Callias (449), but no one could say when trouble with Egypt and other Greek auxiliaries might break out again¹. It was natural in 445 in view of these wars and the possibility of their recurrence that a Jewish poet grateful to Artaxerxes, and not wishing to see his rule disturbed by a conflict which might involve Judea, should utter from his heart the prayers: *Rebuke the wild beast of the reed* (Egypt), *the company of bulls, lords of peoples* (the leaders of Greek or Ionian mercenaries). *Scatter the people that delight in war*. Such wars might mean not only trouble for the Persian king but more serious troubles for Judea, and Egypt at this time seemed the only menace to peace in Syria and Palestine. But 100 years later, the date suggested by Briggs², a Jewish poet could hardly have taken this point of view. Ochus was a cruel and sanguinary tyrant³, and had dealt very savagely with the Jews who had sided with his enemies. His satrap had robbed and oppressed Jerusalem for seven years. His character and conduct were not such as to rouse in a Jewish mind an aspiration that his enemies should be rebuked and scattered. The Jews would probably not have been very sorry if *the wild beast of the reed* had triumphed over Ochus. Their feelings towards him must have been very different from those with which they regarded Artaxerxes. And so while the tone of the Psalm is suitable to the historic atmosphere of 445 it is repugnant to that of 360-350 or of any later period.

In view of the foregoing considerations, of which one line relates to the occasion of the Psalm and the other to its period, we shall base our exposition on the view that it was composed on the occasion of the procession of 445. We trust that when the words of the Psalm are examined in detail they will not be found inappropriate to the event they are assumed to celebrate or to the general history of the time. We shall endeavour to avoid one peril which we think has sometimes led to unfortunate

¹ See for these events Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* III. 750 f., Rawlinson, *Monarchies*, III. 472-5.

² *Vide* p. 10, *sup.*

³ "He is indeed the only monarch of the Achaemenid line who appears to have been bloodthirsty by temperament." Rawlinson, III. 508.

consequences in the explanation of the Psalm, that is, we must avoid drawing inferences about events in the Psalmist's own time from the words of his quotations of old songs. If we are satisfied that any passage is a quotation from a poem—especially where we cannot trace its source—it is not evidence of any fact supposed to have happened in the history of the Psalmist's period. We may explain, if we can, what the quotation refers to, what its date is, and all such matters. We may, indeed we ought, to enquire what led the Psalmist to quote it or how it illustrates his line of thought and way of looking at things; but it must not be used as evidence that the events which it narrates or seems to refer to happened in 445 or any other date when the Psalm was written. The writer does not think it superfluous (especially in view of the methods of some recent expositors) to state that he has not consciously manipulated the text in order to accommodate it to his theory of interpretation. He trusts that his "Critical Notes" will show that while he has endeavoured to make full use of the evidence or, where that fails, of the best conjectural emendations, his judgment on readings may be unsound, but it is not based on any desire to frame a text to suit his theory of the date of the poem. In the same way he has not made any attempt to get rid of portions of the text which cause difficulties in interpretation by striking them out as "glosses" or as "insertions by editors in the original text¹." Not only does he consider this process unsound, but in this poem it seems quite unnecessary. With the exception of the quotations he has found no passage which cannot be reasonably explained either by reference to the history of the period postulated or to the prophetic ideas and visions then current. He has sufficient confidence in his theory to interpret the whole poem in the light of it, and does not propose to cut out any part as defying explanation.

ANALYSIS OF PSALM LXVIII.

(*Observation.* The numbers of the verses in our revised translation and throughout the book are those of the English A. V. which differs from the Hebrew by one verse throughout, as the Hebrew makes the title *v. 1*. Quotations are from our revised translation, for the basis of which see the "Critical Notes.")

¹ See Appendix I.

vv. 1-6. *Expression of Joy in the present deliverance, and celebration of the kindness of Jahveh as displayed in the dealings of His Providence.*

The walls were finished, the gates were hung and confided to trustworthy guardians, and the inauguration ceremony had been held. "And it happened that when all our enemies heard this then all the Heathen around us were afraid and very much cast down and they knew that from our God this work was wrought" (Neh. vi. 16). The poet with these happy events in his mind recalls the old song, "Arise O Jahveh and let thine enemies be scattered and let those that hate thee flee before thee" (Num. x. 31). But it is not prayer now, it is fulfilment. *God has arisen*, the army of Samaria *is dispersing*, and the *haters* of God—the heathen Sanballat, the slave Tobiah, the Bedawin Gashmu—are no longer to be feared. The opposing forces are *driven away like smoke* and *melted like wax*. It is to be noted that the Psalmist does not describe victory in battle but the dispersal and discomfiture of the heathen allies. He had seen with intense relief the Ashdodites marching to the coast, and the Ammonites and Arabs retreating across the Jordan, and their treacherous connections in the city rendered harmless: the combination of the *wicked* had *perished*. So it is now a time for the *righteous* to *rejoice* and exult and to *sing before God*—as they did in the recent procession. Let God come to the city He has made safe. *Cast up a highway for Him* proceeds the poet, using the expression of Deut.-Isaiah. Let Him come *riding through the deserts* as, in the old song (Deut. xxxiii. 25), He is thought of as riding over the heavens. Then there comes into the poet's mind the great deliverance from Egypt long ago and he quotes the ancient song of triumph, "Jahveh is a man of war, *Jahveh is His name*" (Ex. xv. 3). From deliverances in peril and distress, present and past, the poet is led to reflect on the general ways of God's Providence and His kindly care of the helpless and miserable. It is not any special event that is alluded to but the habitual course of His dealings with men. He is *a father* to those who have no father, *a judge of widows*, who have no man to protect them, *bringing solitary ones to dwell in a home* (as Ps. cxiii. 9) and *prisoners into prosperity*. Such is His goodness to the afflicted, but as to rebels (and there are such in the city, Neh. vi. 17, 18) they must *dwell in a land of*

drought. This is not meant to be taken literally as of Bashan or any other locality but metaphorically, like the similar expression, "a dry and thirsty land without water" (Ps. lxiii. 1). When God sends a generous rain on His inheritance (v. 9) it will not refresh those who rebel against Him. Such, the poet joyfully declares, are the habitual ways of the Divine Government.

This section, which does not present any great difficulty in interpretation, strikes the note for the whole Psalm—a note of deliverance and joyfulness. It gives no support to those expositors (notably Reuss) who regard the Psalm as containing an atmosphere of misery and depression. The cheerful view of the dealings of Providence which the poet expresses would hardly have sprung from a heart bowed down by oppression and wrong. And this joyful opening of the Psalm is thoroughly in harmony with the burst of triumph (vv. 31-35) with which it closes.

vv. 7-18. *Retrospective view of God's mighty works for His people in the past, with quotations from old national songs.*

This section of the Psalm displays a very curious and peculiar mode of composition. Quotations from various sources are interspersed with original verses by the author, often without any apparent connecting links. All is historical and has no relation to facts in the author's day. The idea of deliverance and triumph runs through all and is the only guide to the meaning. The task of the expositor must be to examine these quotations and endeavour to ascertain their historical settings and the events to which they relate, and then (a more difficult enterprise) to search out from the author's own verses the transitions and lines of thought which bind together these apparently disjointed fragments into a consistent unity.

v. 7. The poet begins this part of his poem with a quotation from the great song of Deborah to remind his readers of the signal deliverance of that period. The original runs—

*Jahveh when thou didst go forth from Seir,
When thou didst advance from the field of Edom;
Earth trembled moreover. Heavens dropped water,
Moreover clouds dropped water;
Mountains shook before Jahveh,
Yonder Sinai before Jahveh, Israel's God.* (Jud. v. 4-6.)

The words in italics are the parts of the passage of which our poet made use, and the reasons of his omissions may without difficulty be conjectured. Deborah embodied in her song the old belief that Jahveh had come from His seat in Sinai through Edom and thus led the people to Palestine. Similarly in the "Blessing of Moses" it was said:

Jahveh came from Sinai,
And shone on them from Seir;
He shone forth from Mount Paran. (Deut. xxxiii. 2.)

and Habakkuk in the same sense has:

God came from Teman,
And the Holy One from Mount Paran. (Hab. iii. 3.)

These passages taken together certainly show that there was such a tradition of a march through Edom current at various dates¹.

Our poet has later histories in his hands not containing this view of the route of the Exodus, so he does not copy this part of the ancient song. His sources do allude to the tremendous happenings of the Theophany at Sinai (Ex. xix. 16-18, Deut. iv. 11, v. 22), so he quotes that portion, but otherwise, without indicating in detail the route of the progress, he uses the words of the old poem to describe the triumphal march of God's people *through the wilderness* with God *before them*. The word "wilderness" is perhaps reminiscent of another old song:

He found him in a desert land
And in a waste, a howling *wilderness*². (Deut. xxxii. 10.)

v. 9. But the Divine care did not cease when the people arrived in Palestine. God supplied their needs. *A generous rain* might refer to literal rain as in Ps. lxxv. 10, 11, or it might be used as in Ps. lxxviii. 24, 27:

He made manna rain upon them for food...
He made it rain flesh upon them like the dust
And winged fowl like sand of the seas³.

But the parallelism of the verse rather leads to the view that a general sense of Divine protection and Providential care is what the poet means to express. *Thy community dwelt in it*,

¹ Kittel, *Gesch.* 2nd ed. i. 504-7. Burney, *Judges*, 109.

² וּבְתוֹחַ יַלְיָאֵן, the same word as in the Psalm.

³ See Hupfeld-Nowack, *ad loc.*

that is, "in thine inheritance." A very simple statement, but full of significance to the poet. No doubt he would recall the glowing words of national poets describing the happiness of the nation settled and secure by the aid of its God in its fertile Palestinean home (Deut. xxxii. 13, 14, xxxiii. 28). But more than this is meant. The poet had seen the arrival of Ezra and his caravan of returning exiles at Jerusalem after a journey across the desert full of privations and perils and lasting four months (Ezra vii. 9, viii. 31). The old history was repeated. Once again as in the ancient days God had gone before His people through the wilderness, and *when His inheritance was weary* He had *strengthened* it with new leaders and an accession of population. Now, as of old, His community were dwelling in His inheritance.

The poet does not express what it is which God *in His goodness prepares for the afflicted*. The same word¹ is used absolutely (as here) in 1 Chr. xii. 39 in the sense of "preparing (a table)," but this sense is not suitable here. Ewald suggests "this favoured land," which is not unsuited to what has gone before. But the indefiniteness of the phrase seems rather to express the general goodness of Divine Providence. Both in the old days and in the days of the restoration from exile God prepared for the afflicted what they needed.

v. 11. This fine ringing passage is a quotation from an unknown song of victory. It contains no feature to fix its date, but on the whole we are inclined to think that it relates to one of David's campaigns. When *the Lord gave the word* to enter into the war (see Crit. Note) it may well have been a favourable response to enquiry at the sacred oracle (1 Sam. xxiii. 2, 2 Sam. v. 19, 23, Ps. xx. 6). *The women who brought good tidings* recalls some such scene as this: "When David returned from smiting the Philistines, the women came out from all cities of Israel with song and dances...with timbrels, with joy and with triangles, and the women answered and said as they danced

Saul smote his thousands,
And David his tens of thousands." (1 Sam. xviii. 7.)

The fair one at home who divided spoil may be illustrated by the words attributed to the mother of Sisera (Jud. v. 30), and

¹ הָכִינָה.

by the praise which David in his great elegy gives to Saul—that he clothed Israelite girls with scarlet and adorned them with golden ornaments (2 Sam. i. 24). It is not difficult to understand why the poet introduced this quotation. Prominent in his thought must have been the retreat of the army of Samaria with its heathen chiefs—and the joy of the recent procession. The passage from the old song was very suitable to both these joyful topics. Nor was the transition from v. 10 a violent one—such were the good gifts which God prepared for the community who dwelt in His inheritance.

v. 13. It is very difficult to form a satisfactory opinion about this much-discussed passage. It cannot be a direct quotation from Jud. v. 16—the language is too divergent—and yet it seems to be under the influence of that verse both in the form of expression and in the identity of the idea conveyed. The song of Deborah rebuked the inactivity of some tribes across the Jordan and on the sea coast who, in safety themselves, were indifferent to the perils of their brethren:

By Reuben's streams¹ great were the searchings of hearts.

Why didst thou sit still among the sheepfolds

Listening to the bleatings of flocks? (Jud. v. 15, 16.)

In a similar line of thought our passage has:

"Did you lie among the sheepfolds watching the white doves shining in the golden sunlight when your nation was fighting for its very existence?" "The admiration here expressed of the doves' plumage is at once an imitation of these men's usual talk and sarcasm at the things in which they found satisfaction while others were engaged in war²."

There is obviously some connection between the two passages, and two views as to what that connection may be are possible. Verse 13 may be a quotation from a song of the same period as Jud. v, written under its influence and describing the feeling of resentment at the conduct of certain tribes, which was deep and general (see Jud. v. 23). Or it may be that our poet, conscious of similar conduct in his own day and always ready to refer to old national poetry, expressed his feelings in a verse partly

¹ Burney, *Jud.* p. 104, reads "(Utterly reft) into factions was Reuben," supplying conjecturally a verb. But the translation in the text is supported by Job xx. 17.

² Hupfeld-Nowack, *ad loc.*

original and partly a reminiscence of Jud. v. 16, both in language and thought. We think the latter is the more likely view, and it does not seem very difficult to understand why the poet introduced this verse, and why he wished to sound this discordant note in a poem of gratitude and joy and hope. Were there any in his day who, safe in a distant home, refused to take part in the labours and perils which attended the rebuilding of the Jewish state? We suggest that the verse is introduced as a reflection on those Jews who declined to leave their homes and occupations in Babylon and enter upon the hardships of a new life amid the ruins of Judea. Generally speaking the richer and more influential Judeans were very little disposed to return; they left the enterprise to the poor and destitute¹. It will be remembered that no Levites volunteered to accompany Ezra, and it was with some difficulty that he prevailed upon 38 to go with him (Ezra viii. 13 f.). There were in fact two Judean nations, one in Chaldea and one in Judea. So it is not surprising that our poet who had witnessed—perhaps had shared—the toils and dangers of the men who rebuilt the walls, when he thought of the wealthy Jews living in comfort and safety far away, they seemed to him like Reuben or like Gilead who abode beyond Jordan, in the days of Barak. And he expressed this feeling by quoting the sarcasm of the old song about these ancient wars to describe a similar attitude of aloofness in a national crisis in his own day.

v. 14. At this point the thought of the Psalm changes and the next five verses (14–18) are devoted to the glories of Mount Sion, the goal of the recent procession, *the mountain where God delights to dwell*. But before dealing with this thought we must consider this obscure and difficult quotation, which has perhaps caused as much discussion as any verse in the Old Testament. Let us begin with *Salmon*, which we take to be the name of a definite locality (see Crit. Note). But what locality? In Jud. ix. 48 it is related that Abimelek and the people went up to “Mount Salmon” with axes to cut wood. This hill must have been close to Shechem, and it does not seem likely that a wooded slope of this kind would be thought of in connection with a snow-storm. It does not seem to suit our quotation, nor

¹ See Ewald, *Gesch.* v. 79.

does Eusebius¹ connect it with this passage. Modern opinion inclines rather to find our Salmon in the mighty mountain ranges of Bashan. "The mountains of the Hauran with their commanding volcanic peaks Wetzstein finds alluded to in Ps. lxxviii. 16 (15), where mention is made of the peaked mountains of *Basan*. The mountain of *Salmon* mentioned in the same Psalm, v. 15 (14), Wetzstein identified with the Batanean *Mons Asalmonus* of Ptolemy and similarly looks for this in the Hauran mountains²." Similarly Guthe³ says: "The steppes of Hamad and the Druz mountains are the *Salmon* of Ps. lxxviii. 14-15." If this view be correct our quotation relates not to Shechem but to some historical event connected with Bashan. We think it most probable that this rugged archaic fragment is taken from a poem relating to the original conquest of Bashan (Num. xxi. 32-35; Deut. iii. 1-12). This must have been an enterprise of great difficulty. To capture 60 fortified cities and to conquer in a mountainous region a valiant race led by a gigantic king must have meant hard fighting with checks and reverses and anxious moments. We conjecture that our quotation comes from a song narrating some such period of anxiety, and that it recalls an aspiration or prayer that when *Shaddai* scatters hostile kings in battle a snow-storm sweeping down from the mountain peaks of Bashan may complete the destruction of the foe. It was a tradition of the Hauran that snow is reserved in God's treasures for the day of battle and war (Job xxxviii. 22, 23), and terrible falls of snow are recorded there⁴. The use of the Divine name "Shaddai" indicates a high antiquity for the quotation. And it will be remembered that three poems of the same period and dealing with wars immediately preceding the one in Bashan are preserved (Num. xxi. 14, 16, 27)⁵: so there is no antecedent improbability in supposing that this quotation dates from the same heroic epoch and was included like the others in "The Book of Jahveh's wars" (Num. xxi. 14). These views would hold good if with Gesenius and Nowack the mountain Salmon

¹ "Salmon mons quem conscendet Abimelech adversus Sicima dimicans." Lagarde, *Onomasticon*, 153, 285 (the whole reference).

² Buhl, *Geographie des A. P.* p. 118.

³ In Schaff-Herzog, *Enc. art. Bashan*. See Fischer and Guthe's map of Palestine.

⁴ Delitzsch, *Job*, E. T. II. 319.

⁵ Kittel, *Gesch.* 2nd ed. I. 489-90.

were thought to be the mighty *Hermon*, "the mountain of snow" (see Crit. Note)—for the name of "Bashan" extended to the country at the foot of this mountain (Deut. iii. 8, xxxiii. 22)¹.

It is now possible to understand why our poet included this obscure quotation in his work. He is about to enter on his comparison of the giant basaltic mountains of Bashan with their snow-crowned peaks, and the small but beloved hill of Sion, and the thought of Bashan reminds him of the old national song about "the snow on Salmon" which, following his usual method of composition, he proceeds to embody in his poem. It probably meant more to him and his readers than it can mean to us.

v. 15. This verse also is a quotation from an unknown source, possibly from the same poem as the last verse or from some other of the same period. It shows the admiration and awe which the Israelites felt when they first gazed on these mighty mountains of black basalt with their sharp conical peaks towering above the plain. But in v. 16 the Psalmist after he has quoted the old poem expresses a very different sentiment. *Mighty is the mountain range of Bashan with its many lofty snow-crowned peaks*, but it *looks enviously on God's hill, Sion*. This modest elevation with the rebuilt temple upon it is superior to the giant peaks of the Hauran or any other mountain anywhere because *God delights to dwell there*. This recalls the sentiment of another Psalm,

Jahveh loves the gates of Sion
More than all the dwellings of Jacob,

and that to be born a citizen of Sion is a more glorious fate than to belong to the greatest nations and the proudest cities on earth (Ps. lxxxvii).

v. 17. To complete his historical retrospect the poet delineates the progress of God from Sinai to the sanctuary on Sion where He delights to dwell. He treats it first as an invisible and mystic progress. As always his mode of presentment is influenced by literary recollections. Elisha's servant had seen a vision of horses and chariots surrounding the Prophet (2 Kings vi. 17). The "Blessing of Moses" spoke of Jeshurun's God "riding over the heavens," Deut. xxxiii. 26. Habakkuk in his poem wrote:

¹ G. A. Smith, *Hastings' Dict. art. Bashan*.

Thou didst ride upon thy horses,
Thy chariots (were) deliverance (Hab. iii. 8).

Such meditations culminated in a splendid vision of heavenly *chariots, tens of thousands, tumultuous thousands*¹—an unearthly host forming the cortège and escort of *the Lord* in his triumphal progress *from Sinai* to take up his dwelling in *the sanctuary* on Sion.

v. 18. But this mystic progress in the heavens had its correlative on earth, and the poet now takes an instance from national history. This verse is a quotation from a song, probably of the time of David, relating to a triumphal entry of the Ark into Jerusalem after a successful campaign, followed by prisoners and spoil. We are disposed to think that this was the war with Syria and Ammon² (2 Sam. x.-xii.) as the Ark was certainly taken into the field in this war (2 Sam. xi. 11), the campaign was very successful, prisoners and spoil were taken (2 Sam. xii. 26 f.), and when David and the army returned to Jerusalem the Ark must have been solemnly taken back to its tent on Sion (2 Sam. vi. 17). On this or some similar occasion this fine stanza may well have been sung. The allusion to *rebels* in this quotation suits very well this period of David's life, and it would appeal to the Psalmist, who had already (in v. 6) declared that rebels must abide in a thirsty land. The statement in this quotation that such people *must not dwell with Jah* would agree with the policy of Nehemiah, who, as soon as he was in a position to do so, turned such disaffected men and traitors out of the city (Neh. xiii. 28), perhaps being strengthened in his purpose to do so by hearing this song. The two last verses probably owe their inclusion in the song to the impression which the recent procession had made on the poet. He found analogies to that glorious ceremony both in the mystic and heavenly progress of Jahveh to Sion and in the triumphant ascent of the Ark of his presence to *the height*. The progresses and processions all ended in Sion.

With the entry of God into Sion this historical retrospect with its curious use of quotations comes to an end; and the poet now turns his attention to the circumstances of his own times.

¹ These words have an echo of רַבָּבוֹת אֲלֶפֶי, Num. x. 36.

² Delitzsch considered the whole Psalm to relate to this war. *Com.* 445.

vv. 19-23. Jahveh's goodness to His people and vengeance on His enemies.

v. 19. The poet, recalling the terrible strain and the constant danger of the period when the walls were being built, thanks God for *deliverance*. There had been so many deliverances—from the Army of Samaria and its sinister chiefs—from traitors in the city—from the rapacity of money lenders (Neh. v. 3, 4)—from plots against the Governor—even from false prophets (Neh. vi. 14). *He bears our burdens*, exclaims the poet, using the same word¹ as Nehemiah had used when describing the heavy toils of the workmen on the walls. And, with an emphasis which seems to come from personal experience of those terrible days when men were building with their weapons ready for use, he thankfully ascribes to Jahveh *escapes from death*.

v. 21. It can only be from the Psalmist's intimate personal knowledge of perils sustained, and of the treacherous plots of the enemy, that the ferocious expressions of this cry for vengeance can be explained. In language partly borrowed from other poems² he declares

*God will smite the head of his enemies,
The hairy skull of him who goes on in his trespasses.*

This latter phrase seems to mark an individual³ and may well refer to Tobiah who, after the wall was finished and guarded, continued his plots and intrigues with many disaffected nobles of Judea to whom he was related by marriage (Neh. vi. 17, xiii. 6-8). It is an inviting conjecture, though it can be nothing more, that this Ammonite freedman may have been known by some sobriquet equivalent to "Shag-pate."

v. 22. As has been already pointed out on an earlier page this verse is paraphrased from Am. ix. 3, with this difference, that the poet instead of *Carmel* substitutes *Bashan*, which had been recently the subject of his thoughts. Whether the enemies of God are hidden in the inaccessible heights of the volcanic peaks of Bashan or in the deepest parts of the ocean they will not be safe from His vengeance. It should be borne in mind that this passage is a poetic hyberbole and does not contain a

¹ עָמַשׁ, Neh. iv. 11 = עָמָסִים, Neh. xiii. 15.

² רָשָׁע, Neh. vi. 17 = רָשָׁעִים, Hab. iii. 13. יִחְזֹק, Num. xxiv. 17.

³ Reuss (*La Bible*, v. 233) thinks that an individual is aimed at. Wellhausen (*Furness*, p. 191) thinks not.

reference to any actual historical event. If the poet had meant to allude to a real occurrence he would hardly have borrowed for the purpose the mystic language of an ancient seer.

v. 23. It is to be noted that the vengeance so savagely described in these verses is not thought of as being inflicted by the Judean community or by any human agency. It is God who will smite the enemy and His people will rejoice. This sentiment is the same as, but more clearly expressed in, another Psalm.

The righteous man will rejoice because he has seen vengeance,
He will wash his footsteps in the blood of the wicked (Ps. lvi. 11).

vv. 24-31. *The procession and the hopes and visions it inspired.*

vv. 24-27 contain the poet's description of a procession, which we have seen reasons for identifying with the one described in Neh. xii. 27 f. The account in the memoirs of the Governor naturally views the occasion from a slightly different point of view from that of the poet-spectator, who (as Briggs very well observes) only saw a part of the procession and describes what he saw. The main points, such as the double procession—its entry into the temple—the singers—the players on stringed instruments¹—Benjamin—the princes of Judah—naturally appear in both accounts. But the keen eye of the poet, whose mind is filled with old national songs, has noted some points which the Governor did not think it worth while to mention in his official record. Nehemiah does not explain in much detail how his *praise-choirs* were formed. The Psalmist notes the presence of *girls playing timbrels*. For this detail called up the memory of songs of old—Miriam and the girls with timbrels and dances singing the great song of deliverance (Ex. xv. 20)—the women with timbrels and dances who sang the heroic deeds of Saul and of David (1 Sam. xviii. 7)—and he notes the interesting parallel. Some men from Northern tribes went by in the procession. The Governor, even if he knew of their presence, does not record a fact which must have seemed to him of slight importance. But the poet remembers how in the old song

Zebulun and Naphtali were a people that scorned their lives
Unto the death on the high places of the field (Jud. v. 18)

and sets down the names in his poem. Nehemiah does not

¹ מְנַחֵם is a general word for players on any stringed instruments. See Is. xxxviii. 20, Hab. iii. 19.

record what song the *praise-choirs* sang but the Psalmist gives it¹ or a part of it:

*In sacred assemblies bless God;
(Bless) the Lord ye elect of Israel.*

What is meant here by "sacred assemblies"? It has been thought that "choirs" are meant, but the word² has no relation to music. We think the allusion here as in Ps. xxvi. 12 is to "synagogues" (so A.V.). "We may confidently place the origin of the synagogue in Palestine at the period of the Persian domination³." Indeed in Babylon, and in Jerusalem before the restored temple was built, they were a necessity if the people were to worship at all. It is generally assumed that the phrase "all the appointed places of God in the land"⁴ found in a Pre-Maccabean Psalm (Ps. lxxiv. 8) of uncertain date relates to such assemblies. If this be the true sense of the word the underlying thought of the verse seems to be "Not only three times a year in the Temple but every Sabbath in the Synagogue *bless the Lord*."

v. 28. The Temple rebuilt, the wall and gates restored and guarded, heathens and heathenish practices driven out, the sacred law in force, what a series of blessings had been conferred on the Judean state! The Psalmist now expresses his longing that this happy condition of things should continue on a firm basis. *Confirm O Lord what thou hast done for us.* And this thought carries his mind into the future and recalls the glowing visions of Deut.-Isaiah, Haggai and Zechariah of the wealth of all nations flowing to the restored temple and the favoured city.

v. 29. There could be no period when such visions seemed so real and so likely to be fulfilled as the date of this poem. They had indeed already received large fulfilment from the generosity of Persian kings. Cyrus had given the vessels which the Chaldean conqueror had taken away from the former temple (Ezra i. 7). Darius Hystaspis apparently contributed a regular allowance in money or kind towards the expenses of the Temple services (Ezra vi. 9). Artaxerxes had given to Ezra most liberal

¹ See Olshausen, *Com.*, *ad loc.* ² מְקוֹלוֹת, see מְקוֹהִים, Ps. xxvi. 12.

³ W. Bacher in *Hastings' Dic.* art. *Synagogues*.

⁴ כָּל-מוֹעֲדֵי-אֵל בְּאֶרֶץ. See a note in Cheyne, *Psalms*, i. 330.

gifts both of money and precious vessels (Ezra vii. 15, 19, 21, viii. 24) and to Nehemiah a supply of timber without which the walls and gates could never have been built (Neh. ii. 8). With such examples of regal munificence before him, and the words of the prophets familiar to him, it was only natural for him to anticipate with confidence that other *kings* would *bring gifts*, and that the present prosperity of the city would be maintained. The sentiment is not unlike that of another Psalm:

Jerusalem is built as a city which is bound together [by its walls].

May there be peace within thy ramparts,

Prosperity within thy palaces (Ps. cxxii. 2, 6).

v. 30. But there was a danger lest a war should break out between Egypt, aided by Greek mercenaries, and Persia, and disturb the prosperity of Judea. As has been already pointed out this was the danger which at this period was most to be feared by the Jews, and it was emphasised by recent experience. May no such war break out. *Rebuke the wild beast of the reed*, Egypt, under the figure of the *behemoth* or hippopotamus living in covert of reed and marsh¹ (Job xl. 21), and with him all other potentates and warlike chiefs. Let them abandon projects of war and continue to pay their tribute to the Great King, *let them*, thoroughly defeated in the late war, *come grovelling with bars of silver*. The last expression is curious but suitable to the manners of the time. Egypt had little coined money, their trade being done by barter. In the later war of Ochus the Egyptian king had much difficulty with the Greek auxiliaries who refused to receive their pay in ingots of gold or silver, and the ingots had to be coined into pieces of money to pay the Greek soldiers². So no doubt the tribute due from Egypt to the Great King would be paid in crude silver³. *The peoples that delight in war* would seem to mean the Athenian and Spartan soldiers and sailors of fortune⁴ whose armies and fleets were at the service of the highest bidder, and who figured so prominently in the wars between Artaxerxes and the Egyptian king. If there was to be peace and prosperity for Judea there must be no more of

¹ בְּסִתְרֵי קֶקֶה וּבְצֵאָה.

² Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* iii. 760.

³ As to the meaning of רֵצִי־בָרֶךְ see Ewald, *Dichter*, i. 2. 425. The tribute from Jehu to the Assyrian king was paid in bars of silver and gold (Schrader, *Die Keilins. u. d. A. T.* 2nd ed. 208). See the plate in Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* iii. 125.

⁴ See Reuss, *La Bible*, v. 233.

these wars, so the poet adds a prayer that these bands of adventurers may be *scattered*.

v. 31. Very different from thoughts of war is the poet's vision of the future relation of the people of Egypt to Judea. It is a relation of *conversion*¹, based upon prophetic utterances.

"Jahveh shall make himself known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know Jahveh in that day, and shall serve with sacrifice and offering, and shall vow a vow to Jahveh and shall perform it" (Is. xix. 21). "The labour of Egypt and the earnings of Kush [Ethiopia] and the Sabeans, men of stature, shall pass over unto thee and become thine" (Is. xlv. 14). And from the rivers of Kush "shall a present be brought unto Jahveh Sabaoth from the people tall and polished, and from the people terrible ever since it arose, the strong strong nation and all subduing, whose land the rivers divide, to the place of the name of Jahveh Sabaoth, mount Sion" (Is. xviii. 1, 7).

"From beyond the rivers of Kush my suppliants, the daughter of my dispersed, shall bring my offering" (Zeph. iii. 10).

Now that the city is restored the time seems to the Psalmist to have arrived for these glorious visions to be fulfilled. *In haste will they come from Egypt*, not armies to devastate and rob but proselytes to worship with gifts, and even from distant Ethiopia hands will be *stretched forth to God*.

This aspiration shows the profound effect which the zeal of Ezra and the self-denying energy of Nehemiah were producing in Jerusalem. When Ezra first arrived in the city he found the people intermarried with heathens and tolerant of heathen practices. The Sabbath law was a dead letter, the sacrifices were not strictly performed, sacred dues were not paid, sorcery was practised (Ezra ix. 1, 2, 11; Neh. xiii. 10, 15; Mal. i. 8 f., ii. 5, 10, iii. 5). How great a contrast from this state of syncretism and indifference is this desire that the heathen should be converted to the worship of Jahveh! "Nehemiah succeeded in putting the work of which Ezra was the inspirer on a sure basis for the future, and in protecting the Jews from the uncleanness of the heathen and from drifting back into heathenism²." Nothing could show more plainly than this Psalm how powerful was the influence of these great men, and how soon their attack upon the heathenish influences prevalent in Judea began to take effect. The Psalmist was not content with the wish that heathen kings should bring gifts to the temple. His

¹ See Cheyne, *Isaiah*, i. p. 297.

² Wellhausen, *Gesch.* p. 179.

longing was more spiritual, to see heathen peoples from far distant lands hastening to Jerusalem to worship the God of Israel. Such were the hopes and desires which the sight of the imposing procession aroused in a poet saturated as he was in the masterpieces, both lyric and prophetic, of the literature of his nation.

Another view of *v. 31* is possible, which would regard those who were to *come in haste from Egypt* as members of Jewish communities settled there. There were two such communities.

1. There was a settlement of Jews (with some alien admixture) at Jeb (Elephantine) at the first Cataract, opposite to Syene (Assouan). They were there under the Egyptian kings long before the invasion of Cambyses in B.C. 527. They had a temple of Iahō = Jahveh, and seem to have been faithful to their national religion and its sacred rites¹. These were probably "the remnant dwelling in the land of Egypt" (Jer. xxiv. 9), and "the dwellers in the land of Pathros" (Upper Egypt) referred to Jer. xlv. 1, 15.

2. There were such elements as yet remained in Egypt of the great migration after the murder of Gedaliah (Jer. xliii. 5, 7) who had settled at Migdol and Tachpanches (Daphne) near Pelusium, and at Noph (Memphis) (Jer. xlv. 1).

The parallelism of Egypt and Kush in *v. 31* however seems to negative any application of this verse to Jews, and it is easier to connect it with the aspirations of Deut.-Isaiah as to homage paid by the heathen nations to the Temple. "This hope of the conversion of other nations to the faith of God's elect was in an especial manner characteristic of the period of the return from the Babylonish captivity²."

vv. 32—35. Let all nations acknowledge the majesty of God.

In this final burst of lyric enthusiasm the poet soars still higher. Not only Egypt and Kush but all *Kingdoms of the earth* are summoned to join in the chorus of praise. They are to form a great praise-choir to hymn God as *riding upon the ancient heaven of heavens* (Deut. xxxiii. 26, x. 14, *v. 4* of this Ps.) and thundering with a *mighty voice*. But *His majesty is over Israel*. His glory is *from His holy place*, Mount Sion. It is all

¹ See Hoonaker, *Schweich Lectures*, 1914, *passim*; Kittel, *Gesch.* II. 527.

Perowne, note on Ps. xxii. 27.

shown in *giving strength and all power to the people*. He is *Israel's God*. It is the song of restored Judah. The two returns from exile—the rebuilt temple—the fortified city—the favour shown by Persian kings—all are so wonderful that all Kingdoms should join in the song of grateful acknowledgement. The tiny state could never have effected these wonderful things—it is the work of God—Israel's God. Let the whole world sing,

Blessed be God.

No strain could rise higher than this—no nobler vision than this could fire the heart and inspire the song of a Jewish poet. This splendid chorus forms a fitting climax and conclusion to this great song, which has been very suitably designated “the Titan among the Psalms¹.”

It has been pointed out above that a considerable part of the inspiration of this Psalm was derived from the great prophet of the Captivity. But there is one aspect of the latter's message which seems to have met with little or no response in this Psalmist. We mean the hope of a Messiah—and especially the wonderful conception of the suffering and redeeming Servant of Jahveh (Is. lii. 13–liii.). This Psalm of joy and triumph does not seem to contain any direct reference to the Messianic hope. It is possible that behind *v.* 21 there may be some trace of the conception of a conquering and avenging Saviour (as in Is. lxiii. 1–7) but even this is very doubtful, while of the sublimer vision of the Sufferer we discern no trace at all. Absorbed as the Psalmist is by the happy events of the present, all his visions of the future are connected with Sion and its Temple—the glory and the riches and the peoples all are to flow to that centre. It would seem that the revival of ritual law which was the result of Ezra's reforming activity had already begun to lead to this centralising of Jewish thought around the sacred City and the sacred Temple—and that the more spiritual aspects of prophetic teaching tended to fade away from the thoughts of the people. In any case we do not find in this Psalm any conscious allusion to the hope of a Messiah. It is true that S. Paul (Eph. iv. 8) does make a Messianic use of *v.* 18, but it is to be noted that neither the Heb. nor the LXX. text support the reading upon which his exegesis is based, and his very beautiful application of this passage rests not so much on the Psalm as

¹ Delitzsch, *Com. Isaiah*, E.T. i. 332.

on the Targum (see crit. note). The exultation of the Psalmist was based on present deliverances and immediate blessings, his hopes were to be fulfilled in a near future, the dangers he feared were from causes then existing. He did not—perhaps he could not—follow the prophet in his more distant and sublime spiritual visions. It was reserved for the wider knowledge and deeper spiritual insight of the Christian Church¹ to discern in this song of deliverance a parable of another and a greater deliverance—and to apply it to the stupendous event which happened on the day of Pentecost.

¹ The Syriac version heads the Psalm thus "David's, when Kings prepared to make war on his people—and a good prophecy about the dispensation of the Messiah and about the calling of the peoples to faith."

PSALM LXVIII

- 1 God arises—His enemies are dispersing,
They that hate Him are fleeing before Him.
- 2 As smoke is driven away they shall be driven away,
As wax is melted before a fire
The wicked shall perish before God.
- 3 But let the righteous rejoice, let them exult before God,
Let them be glad with joy.
- 4 Sing to God—strike the harp to His name,
Cast up a highway for Him who rides through the deserts,
His name is Jah! and exult before Him.
- 5 A father of fatherless ones, and a judge of widows
Is God in His holy habitation.
- 6 God brings solitary ones to dwell in a home,
He leads out prisoners into prosperity,
But rebels dwell in a land of drought.
- 7 "O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people,
When thou didst advance through the wilderness,
- 8 Earth trembled—heavens also dropped water before God,
Yonder Sinai (trembled) before God—Israel's God."
- 9 A generous rain, O God, thou didst cause to drop on thine
inheritance,
And when it was weary thou didst strengthen it.
- 10 Thy community dwelt in it,
Thou didst prepare in thy goodness for the afflicted, O God.
- 11 "The Lord gave the word,
The women who brought good tidings were a mighty host.
- 12 Kings of armies did flee—did flee,
And the fair one at home divided spoil."
- 13 "Did you lie among the sheepfolds?
The wings of a dove are covered with silver,
And her feathers with yellow gold."
- 14 "When Shaddai scatters kings in her
May there be snow on Salmon."
- 15 "A mighty mountain is the mountain of Bashan,
A mountain with many peaks is the mountain of Bashan."
- 16 Why do you gaze with envy, you mountains with many
peaks,
On the mountain where God delights to dwell?
Yes! (where) Jahveh will abide for ever.
- 17 The chariots of God are tens of thousands,
Tumultuous thousands!
The Lord in their midst came from Sinai to the sanctuary.

- 18 "Thou hast gone up to the height, thou hast led captives
captive,
Thou hast received gifts among men.
Yet rebels must not dwell with Jah Elohim."
- 19 Blessed be the Lord every day.
He, the God of our salvation, bears our burdens.
- 20 The God who is to us a God of deliverances,
And to Jahveh the Lord belong escapes from death.
- 21 But God will smite the head of his enemies,
The hairy skull of him who goes on in his trespasses.
- 22 The Lord declared "From Bashan I will fetch (them) back,
I will fetch (them) back from depths of the sea."
- 23 So that thou shalt wash thy foot in blood;
That the tongue of thy dogs may be red with it.
- 24 Men saw thy processions, O God,
The processions of my God, my King, unto the sanctuary.
- 25 Singers went first, then harpists
In the midst of girls playing timbrels.
- 26 "In sacred assemblies bless God.
(Bless) the Lord ye elect of Israel."
- 27 There (went) little Benjamin at the head,
Princes of Judah and their festal throng,
Princes of Zebulun, Princes of Naphtali.
- 28 Command, O God, thy strength,
Confirm, O God, what thou hast done for us.
- 29 For the sake of thy Temple which is over Jerusalem
To thee shall Kings bring gifts.
- 30 Rebuke the wild beast of the reed,
The company of bulls—lords of peoples;
Let them come grovelling with bars of silver;
Scatter the peoples that delight in wars.
- 31 In haste will men come from Egypt,
Kush will quickly stretch forth her hand to God.
- 32 Kingdoms of the earth sing to God.
Strike the harp to the Lord.
- 33 To Him who rides upon the ancient heaven of heavens,
Lo He sends forth His voice, a mighty voice.
- 34 Ascribe strength to God;
His majesty is over Israel, and His strength is in the clouds.
- 35 Terrible is God from His holy place;
Israel's God!
He gives strength and all power to the people,
Blessed be God.

CRITICAL NOTES

The Heb. variants are taken from Ginsburg, *Masora*, Part i. Text 1894.

The Greek from Swete's *Septuagint*.

Jerome's Latin is quoted from Codex Amiatinus as given in *Biblia Sacra Latina, Vet. Test.* Heyse and Tischendorf, 1873.

Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion (A. S. O.) from Field's *Hexapla*.

"Buhl" refers to his "Psalms" in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*.

1. יָקִים. This verb is not jussive in form, nor does it seem to be an ordinary imperfect used in a jussive sense, *Ges. K.* 107, 4, n. A. It appears to express a plain statement of fact (Briggs, Cheyne). This being a reminiscence of Num. x. 35 the word קִימָה would have been repeated had the jussive force been intended. When the author of this Psalm wrote יָקִים...יְפֹצֵז instead of קִימָה...יְפֹצֵז he must have intended to express a different idea. The earlier passage was an aspiration, the latter was an acknowledgement of present deliverance. It has been suggested (Hupfeld-Nowack) that the word may be an expression of *hope*. No doubt this is a possible use of the jussive (see 1 Sam. i. 23, where the verb has however a jussive form). But it is not so suited to this place as the sense of grateful acknowledgement.

2. בְּהִנְדָּף. This is an impossible form. It may have arisen unconsciously out of assonance with the following תִּנְדָּף, or it may have been coined as a mixed form offering a choice of two possibilities (like נִנְאָלוּ *Ia. lix. 3*, Lam. iv. 14, *Ges. K.* 51, κ). בְּהִנְדָּף must be read.

תִּנְדָּף without an object can hardly be correct. There is a Heb. variant here יִנְדָּף which seems to be followed by Gr. ἐκλιπέτωσαν, Jer. *deficient*, Pesh. ܬܢܕܦܐ. This gains support from the parallelism with יִאֲבֵרוּ in the second line. Hitzig and Ewald would read תִּנְדָּף, Wellhausen and Duhm a second תִּנְדָּף, but neither of these is quite satisfactory. The Heb. variant seems to be the genuine reading.

יִאֲבֵרוּ. Gr. prefix οὐτως. Jer. *sic*=ן which is in any case implicit in the sense. It is not read by Pesh.

3. Many Heb. copies have a vav before יַעֲלֶצֻ, Gr. and Jer. have no vav before this word or before יִשְׁשִׁיז and thus impart a rugged vigour which seems original.

4. שָׁמוּ 1°. Buhl and others propose לְשָׁמוּ with Pesh. but there is no need for any change. The word וְפָר often takes a direct object. Ps. lxvi. 2 כְּבוֹד-שָׁמוּ, Ps. ix. 3 שָׁמַךְ, Ps. lxi. 9 ib., Ps. vii. 18 יֵשׁ, etc.

סלל. This word has been considered unsuitable by Wellhausen, Cheyne and others but it is difficult to see why. It is used Is. lvii. 14, lxii. 10, the noun מסלה Is. xl. 3 and מסליל Is. xxxv. 8. In all these places the thought is that of making a road or causeway for a deliverer, and this sense is eminently appropriate here.

בְּעֶרְבוֹת. Delitzsch and Hitzig suggest a reference to the עֲמוֹאֵב so often mentioned in the early history (Num. xxii. 1, xxvi. 3, 63, Dt. xxxiv, 1, 8, Jos. xiii. 22, etc., cf. Is. xxxv. 1). Probably however the expression is more general. The text gives a quite satisfactory sense. The Gk. ἐπὶ δυσμῶν seems to have read למערב, see Pesh. למערב. Briggs is of opinion that the Gk. represents על־עֲבוֹת (comp. Ps. civ. 3), which he and Cheyne read. But the text is better. The deliverances of Israel in the past and the especial one celebrated in this Ps. were wrought on earth. A progress in the heavens is described v. 33.

בְּיַהּ שְׁמוֹ. The ב is difficult. The passage is cut off from the preceding verbs by the two great accents and is an independent statement. Delitzsch's suggestion that we have here *Beth essentiae* hardly meets the case, Ges. K. 119 i. n. 2, and the translation "In Jah is his name" (*Speaker's Comm.*) is scarcely intelligible. Jer. supports the text but Gk. κύριος ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, Targ. יה שְׁמיה and Pesh. סגל וס פמס testify to a reading without the Beth. On the other hand Σ. διὰ τοῦ ΙΑ and E. 1 ἐν τῷ ΙΑ read the text. The solution seems to be that this is a quotation from Ex. xv. 4 יהוה שְׁמוֹ which forms there a complete half verse, and here is divided from what follows by R'bhia Mughrash. The author of this Ps. constantly quotes from the old poetry of his nation. It is not necessary to read שְׁבָחוּ יְה (Cheyne), שְׁמָחוּ (Briggs) or any other proposed emendation. It is enough if the Beth be omitted.

מְשִׁיב. There is a Heb. variant מְשִׁיב. The text was read by Gr. κατοικίζει μονοτρόπους ἐν οἴκῳ, which is also read by Θ. and Ε', Jer. *inhabitate fecit*, and Pesh. סגל, A. καθίζει, Σ. διδωσιν οἰκεῖν. The reading מְשִׁיב is preferred by Olshausen, Duhm, Hupfeld-Nowack and Briggs, but is not so good as the other. The same collocation of words as the text is found in Ps. cxiii. 9 (Heb. and LXX.), and the prominent thought in both cases is that of solitary persons becoming members of a household—dwelling in a home. The idea of Is. lviii. 7 תְּבִיא בָּיִת quoted by Nowack is not quite the same. In a text written *defective* the variant מְשִׁיב might easily arise.

The meaning "solitary ones" for יְחִידִים is assured by Ps. xxv. 16.

בְּרִשְׁרוֹת is objected to (Briggs, Cheyne) as an Aramaism. But why should an occasional Aramaism be thought strange in a post Captivity document? The verb בָּשַׁר is found Esth. viii. 5. The Gr. ἐν ἀνδρίᾳ, Jer. *in fortitudine* may well be translations of the text, and Pesh. uses the Heb. word.

אָ. Another Heb. reading is אָ followed by Gr. *ὁμοίως*, but it is not an improvement on the adversative sense which seems needed here. Jer. *autem*.

קֹרֶרִים. For this word which is of frequent occurrence (Is. i. 23, xxx. 1, Jer. vi. 28, Hos. ix. 15) Briggs would read מֹרֶרִים, a form which we think is not actually extant. Gr. τοὺς παραπικραίνοντας seems to have read this, taking it as a ptep. of מֹרֶר, of which however no such form is extant. But the text gives a good sense and requires no amendment.

צִחִיקָה is akin to צִחֶצְחָה, Is. lviii. 11 and צִחִיחִים, Neh. iv. 7, Kri. A. translates λεωπερίανδε, Σ. κάυσωνος ξηρότητα, Jer. *siccitatibus*. Ols-hausen compares Ps. lxiii. 2. The Gr. ἐν τάφοις, Pesh. חַסֵּד סִבְחָה seem to have read צִחִיחִים, Jud. ix. 46, 49, 1 Sam. xiii. 6 (Buhl, see Driver, Samuel, 1st ed., 76 and n. 1). But considered as an antithesis to כִּישְׁרוֹת the text is better as conveying a more general idea.

8. וְהִכִּינִי. Buhl suggests וַי which occurs Est. v. 9 and which is implicit in the sense. This is very attractive, as otherwise there is no verb in this hemistich. No version however has any trace of such a reading. Gr. has τοῦ Σινά, Σ. τοῦτου τοῦ Σινά, Jer. *Deus hoc est in Sinai*, Targ. וְהִכִּינִי, Pesh. (curiously) וְהִכִּינִי. The words of the text are certainly a quotation from Jud. v. 5. It has been suggested (Moore, S.B.O.T. Judges, and see *Ges. K.* 136 d. n. I) that the words in Jud. are an ancient gloss, but, even if this be so, the author of this Ps. must have found them there and copied them, so that they form an authentic part of his text.

9. מִתְּנִיָּה. It is not proved that מִתְּנִיָּה has the meaning "sprinkle." Prov. vii. 17 does not seem to the writer sufficient to support this meaning. Hupfeld-Nowack, Duhm and others suggest מִתְּנִיָּה. This word occurs in v. 8 and Jud. v. 4 bis and gives a good sense.

The word נַחֲלֶתֶךָ is most easily joined to the first hemistich against the accents so that the verb has a double accusative (Ewald). The Ethnach should be moved accordingly.

וְנִלְאָה. This word would be better pointed as a participle וְנִלְאָה being a *casus pendens*, *Ges. K.* 116 w. If it be an impft. it would require vav before the following verb which Gr. and Pesh. have.

10. חִיתָּהּ. There is much difficulty about the meaning of this word. חִיה generally means "wild animals" (so Ps. l. 10, civ. 9 and v. 30 of this Ps.), and it is so taken here by Gr. τὰ ζῶα σου. Jer. *animalia tua* and Pesh. But this sense is not satisfactory here, we want something parallel to עֲנִי. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 13 the word certainly means "a band of men." חֵית פִּלֶּשֶׁתִּים, LXX. σύστημα, and in 1 Sam. xviii. 18 חֵי is used in a similar way "my group, my father's clan." In Ps. lxxiv. 19 the word occurs twice and seems to mean in the first occurrence "wild beasts" and in the second חֵית עֲנִיִּךְ "the company of thine afflicted ones" (Perowne). This

view of the force of the word, "thy community," is accepted by Ewald, Olshausen, Hupfeld-Nowack and Hitzig, but rejected by Delitzsch, Briggs and Cheyne. It is supported by נַחֲלֶתָּהּ which refers back to נַחֲלֶתָּהּ, and it is surely the sense here. It would be a poor ground for rejoicing, that "wild beasts" should dwell in the inheritance which God of His bounty has prepared for the afflicted.

11. אָמַר. There has been some doubt as to the force of this word. It has been taken to mean "promise" as Ps. lxxvii. 9 and perhaps Hab. iii. 9 (Wellhausen), or "song of victory" (Hitzig, Olshausen). But it seems to be rather used in a military sense as "a word of command." See Job xxii. 28 וְהִנֵּי-אָמַר וְיָקֻם לָךְ "and if thou dost pronounce a command it will be established for thee." To this day "to give the word" is used in this sense, as denoting the word of a military commander initiating a movement of troops.

12. נִיחַ צִיָּה. This is very difficult. There would seem to have been a word נִיחַ distinct from נִיחָה, and this word had two distinct meanings. In Jer. vi. 2 it must mean "a beautiful woman," cognate to נִיחָה. In Job viii. 6 it must mean "a dwelling," and in Zeph. ii. 6 in plural "dwellings," cognate to נִיחָה. The first of these meanings is found in Gr. ὡραιότης, A. ὡραιότης, Jer. *pulchritudo domus*, Pesh. נִיחָה. The other meaning seems to underlie Σ. διάτρα (see LXX., Job v. 24). Neither sense seems to make possible the rendering "the woman who remains at home." Delitzsch combines both meanings in the translation "Frauenzimmer": identifying the "woman" and "the house" in a way not possible in English. As the meaning "dwelling" does not suit the passage we must translate "the fair one at home." Briggs proposes to read נִיחָה (Cant. ii. 14, etc.) which is quite a reasonable emendation but perhaps hardly necessary.

13. שְׂפָתַיִם. Wellhausen suggests that the first four words of this verse are a gloss from Jud. v. 16. It would be more correct to say that this verse was written under the influence of Jud. v. 16, but that only one of the four words is the same in both places. It is difficult to see why our author did not use the word שְׂפָתַיִם, Gen. xlix. 13, Jud. u.s. The form he uses clearly has the same meaning (see Ez. xl. 43 referring to places for fastening sacrificial animals in the temple). It is curious that both words are in the dual and introduced by וְ. The Gr. κλήρων Σ. ib. A. ὀρίων, Jer. *terminos* need not imply any difference in text. These words probably refer to the "lots" given to the tribes by Joshua (*Ges. Thes.* 1470) which in the case of Reuben were pasture-lands with sheepfolds (see Num. xxxii. 16, 24, Jos. xiii. 23, LXX.).

14. This is a most difficult verse and has caused much difference of opinion. The key to it seems to be that it is a quotation from some old poem not connected at all with Judges v. and otherwise unknown to us

(see Introd.). Olshausen points out that **קָה** refers to some locality mentioned in the old poem but meaningless in a detached line. So also we may explain the use of **שָׁרִי** which in a Psalm of this period seems unlikely. It was used in the old poem as it was used Ruth i. 20, 21.

פָּרַשׁ has been objected to. It is used nine times in Piel (see Lowe, Zechariah, p. 26), and in seven of these places it means "to spread out" (hands or wings). But in Zech. ii. 10 (Heb.) the word certainly means "scatter"—and it should be so rendered here. The versions Gr. *διασπείρειν*, Jer. *dividerit*, and Pesh. support this meaning.

תִּשְׁלַךְ. This is very difficult. The form is jussive and cannot have the force of narration. Nor does it stand in a position where the loss of a preceding *vav consec.* might be suspected, or a rhythmic shortening is likely. A careful examination of this passage has been made by Driver (*Tenses*, 3rd ed. §§ 170, 171, 174 obs.), and as the result he proposes to amend to **תִּשְׁלַךְ**. Delitzsch suggests that this is a case of the use of the jussive in conditional sentences as an expression of the consequences which will ensue if the event mentioned in the first member be assumed to happen (*Ges. K.* 109, 2, b). But this rule is not applicable to our passage. In the examples generally adduced (Ex. vii. 9, Job xxii. 28, etc.) the verb in the first member is jussive or imperative ("the hypothetical imperative" or "the double jussive," Driver, *Tenses*, § 152), which gives its force to the whole. The rule cannot be applied to a passage where the jussive follows an infinitive, thus reducing its jussive force to a simple past or future. The versions do not help, and conjecture has been tried. Wellhausen proposes doubtfully **בְּהַרְשֵׁלֶם**, Duhm **בְּשִׁלָּה** and Lagarde (qu. by Cheyne) **בְּהַר הַשִּׁלָּה**, that is, on Mount Hermon, which was called **תֹּור תלנא** (Targ. Cant. iv. 8, so Hupfeld-Nowack). The writer does not think any of these expedients necessary. The jussive force may be as clearly felt in this passage as in Pss. xi. 6, xii. 4. In Job xxxviii. 22 the snow and hail are viewed as stored up in the Divine treasures "reserved for the day of war and battle." Following this thought we may view this verse as an aspiration, almost a prayer, and translate thus:

When Shaddai scatters kings in her,
May there be snow on Salmon!

coming from the treasures of God to complete the victory, like the hail, Josh. x. 11.

צִלְמֹן. Some doubt has been felt as to whether this is a proper noun, or whether it does not rather mean "a shaded place." The Talmud has "Do not read **בְּצִלְמֹן**, but **בְּצִלְמוֹת**" (Berachoth, 15^b quoted König, *Einleit.* p. 33). The versions support the text except Θ . $\sigma\kappa\iota\acute{\alpha}$. Wellhausen, Cheyne and others propose **צִלְמוֹת**, but it is doubtful whether such a word existed. The place-name **צִלְמוֹנָה** occurs Num. xxxiii. 40. On the whole it seems likely that the ancient song would think of the snow as falling in some

definite locality—and it will be best to retain the text and treat it as a place-name.

15. **בָּשָׁן** bis. The Gr. had a different reading *ὄρος πῖον* in both places, Jer. *pinguis*, Σ. *εὐτροφίας*, all reading **בָּשָׁן**. This reading is not suitable to the noun. A "fat" or "fruitful" mountain would generally be a contradiction in terms—especially when referring to "the mountain of bold peaks" mentioned in this verse. Possibly the first letter of the word was indistinct in the MS. which lay before the LXX. for they do not translate **בָּשָׁן** by *πῖον* in v. 22, although they do so in Ps. xxii. 13. It is somewhat curious that the Targum in v. 22 translates the word **בֹּתַן** (Batanea—Bashan) but in this verse **בֹּתַן**, as if something different but still a proper noun were read. These variants cause some doubt, but the alternative reading is not attractive and there seems no need to alter the text.

בָּשָׁן bis. This difficult word is generally understood to mean "mountain peaks" (see Delitzsch, and G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.* p. 550). Gr. *ὄρος τετυρωμένον* seems to derive the word from **בָּשָׁן** as if the sense was "congealed." See Job x. 10 **וְכִבִּינָה תִּקְפָּאֲנִי**. This sense is not unsuitable to volcanic mountains formed of congealed lava, but is not so appropriate and striking as "peaks—summits" to a mountain called **הַר אֱלֹהִים**. See Ex. iii. 1, Ps. xxxvi. 7. Jer. *excelsus* supports the meaning "high-peaked."

16. **תִּרְצָרֵן**. This word is generally explained from the Arabic, but in view of Ps. cxiv. 4, 6 it is rather tempting to read **תִּרְצָרֵן** (Cheyne), more especially as the latter word is used in reference to "mountains." But the versions support the text. Gr. *ὑπολαμβάνετε* (see Job xxv. 3, LXX.), Jer. *quare contenditis*. As the text gives a sense suitable to the context and was so understood by the versions it is hardly safe to substitute a word from another Psalm even if it is not unsuitable, and, with some hesitation, we keep the text as it is.

17. **רַבְתִּים**. This word can hardly be taken in a numerical sense, "twenty thousand," in elevated poetry. We must either take the dual here in a multiply sense like **שְׁפָתַי** v. 13 (*Ges. K.* 80 f. 97 g) and translate "many myriads" or amend to **רַבְבוֹת** like Num. x. 36. Gr. *νυρισπλάσιον*, Jer. *innumerabilis*, and Pesh. all have this more general sense of the word.

שְׁנָאן. This is an impossible word as it cannot be derived from **שָׁנָה**. Delitzsch corrects to **שְׁנִין**, but this word does not seem to exist. Jer. *abundantium* probably read the text, but the other versions differ from it and from each other. Gr. *ἐθηνούντων* perhaps **שְׁנִינִים** Ps. cxxiii. 4 which is not at all suitable, Σ. (and A.?) *ἡχούντων* = **שְׁחִין** (Buhl, see Jer. xlviii. 45). Pesh. has **ܫܠܐ** probably referring to the Heavenly host, most likely a guess at the meaning of an obscure word. On the whole **שְׁחִין** seems the best, "tumultuous thousands." The verse is reminiscent of Num. x. 36,

but here the chariots are heavenly (as Dt. xxxiii. 26, Hab. iii. 8), and the myriads of their occupants are the Heavenly hosts (Hupfeld-Nowack).

אֲדָרִי בָּם סִינִי בְּקָרְשׁ. This passage cannot be translated so as to yield any sense. Delitzsch "ein Sinai ist in Heiligkeit" cannot be felt to be satisfactory. The versions simply translate the text without trying to make it mean anything. The phrase seems to come from Deut. xxxiii. 2 יהוה מִסִּינִי בָּא, and there is a Heb. variant יהוה בָּא מִסִּינִי which is generally accepted. But this reading fails to connect the second hemistich with the first. Perowne suggests אֲדָרִי בָּם בָּא מִסִּינִי which may well be the original, each of the alternative Heb. readings having lost one of the two similar short words. We adopt this as the true reading.

שֶׁכֶּנֶז with the article means the holy temple, Ps. lxxiii. 3, lxxiv. 3, lxxvii. 14, and v. 25 of this Psalm.

18. לִקְחֹת מִתְּנוּת בְּאֶרֶץ. Is there any trace of a Gk. variant in Eph. iv. 8, where S. Paul quotes these words ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις instead of LXX. ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ? Apparently S. Paul was quoting from memory and was familiar with the Targum which reads יִהְיֶה לָהֶוֹן מִתְּנָן יִהְיֶה לְבָנֵי נִשָּׂא (Delitzsch). But, what is perhaps more important, the Pesh. agrees with the Targ. pretty closely **ܠܚܝܬܢܐ ܡܢܬܢܐ ܕܥܡܐܢܐ**. Jer. agrees with Gr. *accepisti dona in hominibus*. The reading of Pesh. and Targ., though interesting, cannot claim to be original. The conqueror in his triumphal progress takes captives and receives gifts as a sign of submission. The variant would not be in harmony with the rest of the verse.

בְּאֶרֶץ. This phrase meaning "among men" (*Ges. K.* 119 i) may be found Ps. lxxviii. 66, Jer. xlix. 15, Mic. vii. 2.

וְאֵף סוֹרְרִים לְשֹׁכֵן. Gr. and Jer. support the text but Pesh. has a very interesting and important variant **ܠܡܢ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܐܢܐ**. We think we have here the true reading. It is hardly conceivable that the Psalmist after saying that the rebels are to dwell in a thirsty land, v. 6, would insert just here the statement that Jahveh will dwell with rebels. The **ܠ** has in some way taken the place of **ܠܐ**. We propose to read **ܠܐ ܕܥܡܐܢܐ** (Wellhausen). **ܠܐ ܕܥܡܐܢܐ** (Duhm) is possible but not quite so good.

19. יִשְׁעֵם-לָנוּ. This verb is intransitive (see Gen. xlv. 13), and the **ܠ** is used in loose connection with the verbal idea, "in relation to" (*Ges. K.* 119 w). "He bears the load in relation to us=our load." Jer. *portabit nos Deus*. Gr. *καθευδῶσει*, perhaps יִשְׁעֵם-לָנוּ, as Prov. xv. 21. This is no better than the text, if as good. The text is supported by A.Σ. *βαρῶσει ἡμᾶς*. Hitzig translates *will man belasten uns* but this does not suit the general meaning of the verse.

22. מִפְּעֻלוֹת. Gr. for **ܕ** reads **ܐ**, probably a copyist's error for **ܐ**, Jer. *in*.

23. תִּמְחֹץ. This word gives no sense, although Jer. *calcet* attempts to translate it. It has evidently come in by mistake from v. 22. There is a

Heb. variant **תְּרַחֵץ** which is followed by Gr. βαφῆ, Pesh. **ܬܪܚܝܥ**, and is obviously right. Hitzig proposes **תְּחַמֵּץ** which is not unsuitable but cannot be adopted in the face of such evidence.

מֵאֵיבִים מְנָהוּ. This is repeated by the versions, but it is simply impossible to construe this hemistich as it stands. It has been generally agreed (Perowne, Olshausen, Wellhausen, Duhm) to read **מְנָתוּ** "his portion," for **מְנָהוּ**, but even with this change the sentence halts—it needs a verb and one conveying an idea parallel to **רָחַץ**. In such a case we are compelled to resort to conjecture. Buhl suggests instead of **מֵאֵיבִים** to insert **מֵאֲדָם** (Ex. xxv. 4, Nah. ii. 4) which, not without hesitation, we adopt, retaining **מְנָהוּ** in the text.

25. **שָׂרִים**. There is a Heb. variant **שָׂרִים** which is followed by Gr. ἀρχοντες, Pesh. **ܫܪܝܐ**, but not Jer. *cantatores*, Σ. φδοί. This reading has little to recommend it. This verse deals with the musical part of the procession. The princes appear *v.* 27.

26. **מִמְקֹר**. It is difficult to attach any meaning to this expression and little help is derived from Is. xlviii. 1 (where the text is very doubtful) and Is. lvii. 1, cited by Ewald, Perowne, Olshausen and Hupfeld-Nowack. The versions must have read the word in the plural **מִמְקֹרִי**. Now there is a Heb. variant **מִמְקֹרְאִי**, a word which is extant Is. xlviii. 12 and there as here connected with "Israel." This gives an excellent sense and suits the passage. The preposition **מִ** seems to have the sense of "namely" (*Ges. K.* 119 w, note 1). We may omit this particle in rendering into English and translate "Ye elect of Israel" = the devout Israelites who assembled in synagogues.

27. **רָדָה**. This is a real *crux interpretum*. Wellhausen pronounces the expression unintelligible, and it really seems so. The verb **רָדָה** means "to rule," "to lord it," "to subdue," as Ps. cx. 2, and it could hardly be used to describe so mild an action as "to go first in a procession." Still Jer. *continens eos*, A. ἐπικρατῶν αὐτῶν, Θ. παιδεύτης, E¹. παιδεύων ἢ διδάσκων all seem to have read the text. But the word **רָדָה** in its true meaning could never have been applied to the tribe of Benjamin after the days of Saul. And what does the suffix mean? Ruling whom? Gr. ἐν ἐκστράσει (and perhaps Pesh.) took the word as from **רָדָם**, but this is equally difficult. This word generally means "to be in a deep sleep." In two places it denotes (Dan. viii. 18, x. 9) "to be prostrate through overpowering emotion." Neither sense will suit this place. Buhl and others suggest **רִידִים** from Dt. xxxiii. 12 where this word is applied to Benjamin. This is very attractive in view of this Psalmist's habit of quoting old songs. But on the whole the best suggestion is **רָדָם** as in *v.* 25 (Hupfeld-Nowack, Duhm) which gives an absolutely good sense and only requires the alteration of one letter.

רִנְתָּם. As to this word also we must agree with Wellhausen "unintel-

ligible and probably corrupt." We cannot get any sense from $\sqrt{\text{רנ}}$, as if "a heap of stones" was equivalent to "a heap of men." The versions are only guesses at the meaning and afford no guidance. Could the true reading be רַנְשָׁתָם Ps. lxiv. 3? The meaning of this word seems assured by Ps. lv. 14 $\text{בְּרִית אֱלֹהִים נְהַלֵּךְ בְּרִנָּשׁ}$ "We used to walk in a festal throng." We are not aware of any objection to this reading except that it is an Aramaism (Cheyne), and this is a very doubtful proposition. It would be well to prefix vav (from Pesh.) before this word.

28. צוֹה אֱלֹהִים . It is generally agreed that this should be read צוֹה אֱלֹהִים with Heb. var. and all the versions.

29. מִהֶבֶלָה . Some critics (Perowne, Hupfeld-Nowack) would remove these words to the end of v. 29. This does not seem to be any improvement. The preposition מִ here is used in its frequent causative sense "because of" (Cant. iii. 8, Est. v. 9, *Ges. K.* 119 z). The Temple is the reason why Kings should send gifts. As Ewald points out, the Temple is thought of as towering over (עַל , Gr. $\epsilon\pi\iota$) the city, both in fact and morally. So Σ . (finely) $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \nu\alpha\acute{o}\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{Ἱερ}$. This thought would be lost if the proposed change were made.

30. בְּעֻלָּי . This word though translated by the versions is very suspicious. We know of no place where עֻלָּיִם is used in this way, and the explanation of "calves of peoples" as denoting the "common people" as opposed to the magnates is not convincing. Buhl suggests בְּעֻלָּי (cf. Is. xvi. 8 בְּעֻלֵי נֹוִים) which is quite suitable.

$\text{מִתְרַפֵּס בְּרַצֵּי־כֶסֶף}$. This cannot be considered quite satisfactory. Who is the subject of the verb? Should it not be in the plural? The versions generally give no help, their text is not only very different but it is not intelligible. It has been proposed to read רָצִי "taking pleasure in" and this has been widely accepted. Wellhausen and Hupfeld-Nowack would also read הִתְרַפֵּס thus adding another Imperative to נַעַר and translating "Tread down those who delight in silver." It is however doubtful whether the Hithpaël can be used in this sense. The Kal of רַפֵּס means "to trample on," Ez. xxxii. 2, but the Hithp. has rather the sense "to let oneself be trampled on" (*Ges. K.* 54 f.), "to grovel," as Pr. vi. 2. It is to be noted that all the versions read some verb in the plural, and a plur. seems wanted here. Perhaps the true reading is תִּתְרַפְּסוּ . If (with Ewald) we take רַצֵּי as meaning "bars" or "ingots," A. $\tau\rho\alpha\chi\omicron\iota\varsigma$, and translate "Let them come grovelling with bars of silver," this would agree with v. 18 where the conqueror receives gifts, and v. 29, where Kings bring offerings.

בָּזָר must then be read בִּזְרָה with Hebrew variant and all the versions.

31. הִשְׁמָנָה . This word only occurs elsewhere in proper names הִשְׁמָנוֹן Num. xxxiii. 29, הִשְׁמָנוֹן Jos. xv. 27. It is thought to mean "fat"=rich. The word is written with Samech in the Targum חֹסְמָנִיָּה . It has been suggested that this word appears again in the name Hasmonæans, the

patronymic of the Maccabees (*Ges. Thes.* p. 534, Ewald, *Gesch.* E. T. v. 307 n. 1), but the reading in the text is very doubtful. The Gr. and Pesh. versions take the word to mean "ambassadors." Probably this was a mere guess from the context and does not imply a variant reading. One might conjecture מְשַׁמְנִים, Is. x. 16, Ps. lxxviii. 31, an easier word in the same sense. Duhm proposes מִשְׁמָנִים "mit Ölen," which is most unlikely; see Hos. xii. 1. A. οἰσουσιν ἐσπευσμένως, Jer. *offerantur velociter*, suggest a reading מְשַׁמְנִים (so Buhl, Briggs). The text may well have arisen out of a dittograph of the following מְנִי and the מ in the next word. We think this reading מְשַׁמְנִים may be adopted.

תְּרִיץ יָדָיו. This seems an unusual and unlikely form of expression "Kush shall make her hands run to God." Yet as parallel to חָשִׁים it embodies the same idea of "haste." The noun should be singular with Gr. A., Σ., Pesh. יָדָה (Buhl). The versions read the verb in the text, Gr. προφθάσει χεῖρα αὐτῆς, Jer. *præveniet manus ejus*, Pesh. מִלְּפָנֵי יָדָהּ. It has been proposed (Delitzsch, Wellhausen, Hitzig, etc.) to read תְּרִים Gen. xiv. 22, see Dan. xii. 7. But this does not suit the sense of the passage. To "lift up the hand to God" means to take an oath (Spurrell, *Notes on Genesis*, 144, Driver, *Genesis*, 166), an idea quite foreign to the thought of this verse. The hand which Kush hastily sends out to God offers allegiance and gifts. Ewald very cleverly combines both readings in his translation, "dass Kush in eile seine Hand zu Gott erhebe." We retain the verb in the text.

35. מִמְּקֹדֶשָׁיָךְ. Should this be singular or plural? Is the preposition right? There are two Heb. variants (a) מִמְּקֹדֶשְׁךָ, (b) מִמְּקֹדֶשָׁיו, Gr. ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (Σ. ἁγίοις) αὐτοῦ, Jer. *in sanctis suis*, Pesh. as the text, Σ. ἐν ἁγιάσματι. On this evidence מִמְּקֹדֶשָׁיו ((b) above) seems the best. Judah at this period had only one "sanctuary."

APPENDIX I

ON SUPPOSED INTERPOLATIONS AND GLOSSES

We have reserved for separate treatment the proposals of some editors to omit, without evidence and for purely subjective reasons, considerable portions of the text of this Psalm. The most extensive of these schemes that we have observed is that of Briggs (*Int. Crit. Com. Psalms*, 1907, II. 94 sqq.), who proposes to cut out a full fourth of the text either as "additions of an editor" or as "glosses." Let us take first the editorial additions. It is suggested that vv. 19—20, v. 29 and vv. 31—35 are not part of the original song but were inserted by some hypothetical (and mythical) editor. No linguistic differences are pointed out which distinguish these verses from the rest of the text; the excision of them rests entirely upon the taste of the present editor.

What then is the reason for striking out vv. 19—20? Because they are not suitable to "a warlike Psalm." But our Psalm is not a warlike song. It is a song of joy for deliverance from peril. Apart from the historical allusions there is very little about war in it. Its central theme is a procession not a battle. It rejoices that danger is averted by Divine help, and prays that other perils may still be averted. But suppose it is a warlike song. What could be more characteristic of a soldier on service than carrying burdens and incurring perils of death? What more appropriate thanks could a devout warrior offer to his God when the peril was past than this—that God had borne his burdens and given him escapes from death? The thought of these verses is in complete harmony with vv. 1—4: there has been deliverance and it has come from God. We fail to see any reason or any pretext for striking these beautiful verses out of the Psalm, and if our exposition of them above be accepted they are full of significance in its interpretation.

As regards the omission of vv. 29 and 31, such a proposal is contrary to well-known facts. It has been well recognised ever since the time of Ewald, and cannot be denied, that the author of this Psalm was influenced by the ideas of Deutero-Isaiah; and this we have shown above in four separate passages. These verses belong to them. The ideas of the gifts of kings and the conversion of Egypt and Kush must have been suggested to the writer by the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah and Zephaniah. Now, if the author of the Psalm is shown to have been influenced by these oracles in other places, he is the most likely person to have been under a similar influence in these places also, and it is not scientific to invent an imaginary glossator, of whom we know nothing, and suggest that he inserted the verses. We know that the author of the Psalm lived in an atmosphere where the thought

of the verses would be natural to him. We know nothing of the postulated editor, not even that he ever existed. And it is very unlikely that these sentiments of the Captivity-prophet would have been inserted into the poem as new thoughts long after 350 B.C. Such a theory is entirely unnecessary—there are no phenomena which call for it and no difficulties which it solves.

As regards vv. 32—35 we can only express surprise that any expositor should suggest that this noble burst of song was not written by the author of the Psalm. Surely an author who wrote the fine opening of the Psalm was artist enough to provide an equally fine conclusion. No one can really think that this poem suddenly and abruptly ended with the words *Scatter the peoples that delight in war*. It must have had a final chorus. And we find it hard to realise how anyone can doubt that these verses are from the same hand as vv. 4 and 17. The joyous tone is the same as that of the rest of the Psalm as well as the style and the diction. The verbal similarities are numerous and striking—שִׁירוּ לאלהים זמרו v. 4, לרכב v. 28, אל ישראל v. 8, ברוך v. 19, יתן (of the voice) v. 11, מקדש see קדש vv. 17, 24. The thoughts are the same. God riding through the heavens, v. 17. His temple, vv. 17, 24, 29. Giving strength to His people, vv. 7, 19, 20, 28. Blessed be God, vv. 19, 26, etc. And the whole of these verses like the rest of the Psalm are strongly influenced by Dent. xxxiii. 2, 26. We do not know what more can be adduced in proof of identity of authorship than similarity of tone, of diction, of thought, of literary influence. And it will be observed that these verses do not introduce any strange or striking locutions or any thoughts foreign to the rest of the Psalm, as might have been expected if they came from a different hand.

The result of the excision of vv. 19—20, 29 and 31—35 is to strike out of the Psalm a great proportion of its joy, and we think that this result has (in all probability unconsciously) influenced Briggs in removing them from the text. Like Nowack and Reuss he thinks that the Psalm was the product of an age of misery and depression, and this view is not consistent with the happy and triumphant tone of these verses. This difficulty is avoided by regarding them as the interpolation of a later editor, only, if this effect is to be produced, vv. 26 and 28 ought to be struck out as well.

Those, however, who (like the present writer) think that the Psalm is a song of thankfulness for deliverance and that the procession was an expression of such thankfulness, and who are able to indicate a period and an occasion to which such a song of joy was suitable, will not be likely to agree that most of the joyful parts of the poem are not original but interpolated. Before they can acquiesce in such a conclusion they must expect to be shown the usual marks of interpolated passages, such as peculiarities of diction, change of point of view, differences of representation, interruption of the sense. If these features are not present they will, in fact they must, regard these verses as part of the original poem.

We now turn to the suggestion that some words in admitted verses

ought to be struck out of the text because they are "glosses" inserted by an editor. Now there is a class of glosses which there is very little difficulty in identifying, such as interrupt the sense and are obviously out of place. Very often they are marginal notes of a reader taken up into the text by an unintelligent copyist. Examples of such are Deut. x. 6, 7, Is. xxviii. 20, Jer. x. 11. But we have not observed among the passages thought by Briggs to be glosses any of this kind. The words proposed to be omitted run smoothly enough, they have been accepted as part of the text by many learned expositors, and the reasons for cutting them out must be reduced to the personal taste of the editor or his theory of interpretation; they are subjective and peculiar to himself. It is obvious that this being so the subjectivity of other editors may well lead them to omit other passages, till there are as many texts conjecturally cut down in this way as there are editors.

Let us proceed to examine some of the longer omissions. In *v.* 8 it is proposed to omit "Yonder Sinai before God—Israel's God."

We have pointed out above that a very large part of *vv.* 7 and 8 is copied verbally from Jud. v. 4—6, and the words quoted above are all to be found in Jud. v. 5. We think it a more reasonable view of the facts that the *whole* quotation was made by the poet, and we see no indication which compels us to assume that half of *v.* 8 was quoted by the poet and the other half by a (supposed) glossator.

v. 13. A suggested gloss on this verse is discussed in the Critical Notes.

It is suggested by Briggs that *v.* 17 is encumbered by glosses to such an extent that the original is lost among them. So he strikes out the greater part of the verse and gives as the genuine text

יְהוָה רִכְבָּת מִסִּינִי בְקָדֵשׁ

"Jahveh, thou didst ride from Sinai into the sanctuary."

Considering that this emendation is conjectural, and not dependent on evidence, it might have been more poetical. It is a poor tame verse and we shall be much surprised if any reader of taste thinks it an improvement on the text. The fine vision of the heavenly progress based on Num. x. 36, Deut. xxxiii. 2, Hab. iii. 8, etc., would dwindle away into a very dull prosaic thing if this suggestion were adopted, and there would be the curious phenomenon of a poor original *improved* by a glossator. This mutilated verse is simply out of the question, and can never hope to be accepted. The verse does require some critical treatment (see Critical Notes), but this does not involve spoiling it.

In *v.* 24 it is proposed to omit as a gloss the words in the second hemistich

"processions of my God my King."

This cut would spoil the verse, which is a fine example of *climatic parallelism* or *ascending rhythm*, where the first line is itself incomplete and the second line takes up words from it and completes them (see Ps. xxix. 1, 8, Driver, *Introd.* 1st ed. 341, Cheyne, *Isaiah* i. 147). Here the first line

names the *processions* and the second repeats the word and carries the thought on to completeness by adding *into the sanctuary*. This beauty of Hebrew poetry is to be cut down to one dull line :

"Men saw thy processions, O God, into the sanctuary."

The poet knew better than that, and we cannot doubt that we have the text as he wrote it.

The cases we have considered are the longest portions of text proposed to be omitted as "glosses." We do not think it needful to examine all the places where the supposed gloss only consists of a word or two. It will be enough to look at one as a specimen.

In v. 10 b, "Thou didst prepare *in Thy goodness* for the afflicted, O God," it appears that "in Thy goodness" is a gloss. We appeal to anybody with any feeling for literature as to whether this omission is not something lost from the beauty of the line. God, says the poet, prepares for the afflicted because it is His nature to be benevolent. The same word (טוֹבָה) is found Ps. lrv. 12 in a similar sense

"Thou hast crowned the year *of thy goodness*."

There is no critical necessity to strike it out of this passage.

Now these omissions, which suggest that in the Hebrew text of this poem there are 8 verses, nearly 4 half verses, and a number of odd words (out of 35 verses in all) which were not written by the poet, do not rest on any external evidence at all. No Hebrew MS. and no version omit any of them. We are asked to omit them from the text as spurious or obtrusive in deference to the personal taste of the editor or in the interest of his scheme of interpretation. If (as we suspect) the latter is in many cases the reason for cutting out portions of the text, how can any confidence be felt in results so obtained? "Interpretations which rest on extensive alterations of text are desperate expedients. The editors who adopt such a system have renounced the explanation of the poem and are explaining something else. It is not to be thought that such a system can ultimately give satisfaction or that an enduring exegesis can be built up on the shifting and insecure basis of subjective criticism" (Cannon, *Song of Songs*, p. 140). It is the duty of an expositor to explain the text as he finds it and not to leave out large portions, and this is the reason why the older commentaries are often found by a student to be much more helpful than their modern successors.

APPENDIX II

THE LATIN TEXTS OF THE PSALM

Those who are acquainted with the Latin of the Vulgate can hardly have failed to observe that the readings from Jerome cited in the notes above differ widely from the text with which they are familiar. The explanation of this discrepancy will appear from the history of the successive labours of Jerome on the translation of the Psalter. The Old Latin Version of the Bible had originally been made not from the Hebrew but from the LXX. (Scrivener, *Introd. Crit. N.T.* p. 349, ed. 3, Driver, *Samuel*, p. liv). This will be quite obvious to anyone examining the Old Latin text of Ps. lxxviii (in Sabatier II. 130 sqq.). This version in Jerome's day seems to have been in a lamentable condition through an almost infinite variety of readings, "tot enim sunt exemplaria pene quot codices" (White, in Hastings' *Dict.* art. Vulgate, IV. 873). Jerome's first revision of the Psalter appears to have been inspired by Pope Damasus and is thus described by himself: "Psalterium Romæ dudum positus emendarem et juxta LXX. interpretes licet cursim magna illud ex parte correxeram" (Præf. in lib. Psalm. *Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, x. 106). It will be observed that in this revision no use was made of the Hebrew text. This first edition was known as the *Roman Psalter*, which is said to be still in use at St Peter's at Rome, and at Milan (White, *u. s.* 874 note). As time went on this version became as faulty as the Old Latin, "Quod quia rursum videtis, o Paula et Eustochium, scriptorum vitio depravatam plusque antiquum errorem quam novam emendationem valere" (*Opp.* x. 106). Jerome thereupon undertook a second revision, making use of Origen's critical signs and relying not only on the LXX. but also on the Greek version of Theodotion. This second edition is known as the *Gallican Psalter*, as it was early and widely known and used in Gaul. It is the version of the Psalter now currently in use in the Latin Church. But no one knew better than Jerome himself the unsatisfactory nature of these revisions. It was brought home to him in the course of controversies in which he or his friends became involved with Jewish opponents, "Quia igitur nuper cum Hebræo disputans quædam pro Domino Salvatore de Psalmis testimonia protulisti, volens ille te eludere per sermones pene singulos adserebat non ita haberi in Hebræo ut tu de LXX. interpretibus opponebas, studiosissime postulasti ut post Aquilam Symmachum et Theodotionem novam editionem latino sermone transferrem" (Sophronio suo, *Opp.* ix. 1155). And again, "Qui (Christus) scit me ob hoc in peregrinæ linguæ eruditione sudasse ne Judæi de falsitate Scripturarum Ecclesiis ejus diutius insultarent" (Præf. in Isaiam, *Opp.* ix. 686). In addition the continued diversity and corruption of Greek editions called him to further labours: "Nunc vero cum pro

varietate regionum diversa ferantur exemplaria et germana illa antiqua translatio corrupta sit atque violata" (Præf. in Paralip. *Opp.* ix. 1405). So Jerome decided to make a new translation of the Psalter from the Hebrew, and perhaps there was never anyone better qualified to do so. Not only had he by years of study acquired a thorough knowledge of Hebrew, but from his various Jewish teachers (see Driver, *Samuel*, p. lv and notes) he had acquired the living Palestinian tradition of interpretation, much of which is now lost to us. In addition he was able to make use of the help afforded by all the existing Greek translations. He has himself described his general method of translating the O.T.: "Nullius auctoritatem sequutus sum sed de Hebræo transferens magis me LXX. interpretum consuetudini cooptavi...interdum Aquilæ quoque et Symmachi et Theodotionis recordatus sum" (Præf. in Eccles. *Opp.* iii. 381).

Jerome's Latin Bible (including the Psalter translated from the Hebrew) is best represented by the celebrated *Codex Amiatinus*. This MS. was written in a British monastery, probably at Jarrow, and was sent to Rome as a gift to the Holy See by Abbot Ceolfrid (White, *u. s.* p. 878). In the 9th century it was presented, under circumstances which are not quite clear, to the monastery of Monte Amiata in Tuscany by one Petrus Longobardorum its Abbot. On the suppression of the monastery in 1786 the MS. was deposited by order of Peter Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany, in its present home in the Laurentian Library in Florence (Heyse and Tischendorf, *Vulgate*, proleg. p. vii). "For a recovery of Jerome's original text, *Am.* is of the first importance and any critical edition would have to be based upon it" (White, *u. s.* p. 884).

The following examples will do something to illustrate the way in which Jerome's translation from the Heb. in Ps. lxxviii. differs from his Gallican Psalter.

<i>Gallican following Gk.</i>	<i>Jer. following Heb.</i>
4 Dominus nomen illi	In Domino nomen ejus
6 unius moris	Solitarios
(O. L. unanimes)	
similiter	autem
qui exasperant	increduli
in sepulchris	in siccitatibus
	(with A. and Σ.)
15 Coagulatus	excelsus
(O. L. caseatum)	
17 lætantium	abundantium
19 prosperum iter facit nobis	portavit nos
	(with A. and Σ.)
23 intingatur	Calcet
25 Principes	Cantatores
	(with Σ.)

27 in mentis excessu (O. L. in pavore)	Continens eos (with A. and Σ.)
30 ut excludant eos	calcitrantium
31 Veniunt legati	offerantur velociter (with A.)
32 psallite Deo	omitted
33* ad orientem	a principio

In other places the Gallican is followed against the Heb., e.g.

13 Cleros	terminos (with A. and Σ.)
15 pinguis (bis)	pinguis (bis)

Sometimes, but not often, Jer. follows neither Gallican nor Heb., e.g.

9 dei Sinai	Deus hoc est in Sinai
12 dilecti dilecti	fœderabantur

When the revision of the Latin Bible was taken in hand by Pope Sixtus V (d. 1590) the version of the Psalter made by Jerome from the Heb. was not included, although *Codex Amiatinus* was sent to Rome to be examined by Card. Caraffa the editor (Heyse and Tisch. proleg. p. ix). The Gallican Psalter was too well known to be displaced in the affections of priests and people by a strange version. In the preface to the *editio princeps* of the Vulgate issued by Clement VIII in 1592 that Pope remarks: "In hac tamen pervulgata lectione sicut nonnulla consulto mutata ita etiam alia quæ mutanda videbantur consulto immutata relicta sunt, quod ita faciendum esse *ad offensionem populorum vitandam* Sanctus Hieronymus non semel admonuit" (Heyse and Tisch. p. xxiv). So the Gallican Psalter has remained in the Vulgate to this day. It will be interesting to see whether, in the revision of the Vulgate now in progress, Jerome's version of the Psalter will at last come to its own.

202993

Bib. Lit.
Comment. (O.T.)

Psalms

C.

Author Cannon, William Walter

Title The 68th Psalm.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

